



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Per. 971e. $\frac{126}{16}$



THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.



Πύλαι ἔδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.—*Matt. xvi. 18.*

VOL. XVI.



LONDON:
WILLIAM EDWARD PAINTER, STRAND;
AND ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.
MDCCCXLIV.

CONTENTS.

ART.		PAGE
I. SYMBOLISM, AND THE SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE.		
1.	The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments : a translation of the First Book of the <i>Rationale Divinorum Officiorum</i> . Written by W. Durandus, sometime Bishop of Mende. With an Introductory Essay, Notes, and Illustrations, by the Rev. J. M. Neale, B.A., and the Rev. B. Webb, B.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge.	
2.	Hierurgia ; or, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. With Notes and Dissertations, elucidating its Doctrines and Ceremonies. By Daniel Rock, D.D.	
3.	Aunt Elinor's Lectures on Architecture. Dedicated to the Ladies of England.	
4.	Practical Remarks on some of the Minor Accessories to the Services of the Church ; with hints on the preparation of Altar-cloths, Pede-cloths, and other Ecclesiastical Furniture: addressed to Ladies and Churchwardens. By Gilbert T. French	1
II. MODERN RELIGIOUS POETRY.		
1.	The Waldenses ; or, the Fall of Rora. A Lyrical Sketch, with other Poems. By Aubrey De Vere.	
2.	The Search after Proserpine, Recollections of Greece, and other Poems. By Aubrey De Vere	29
III. GRESLEY'S ANGLO-CATHOLICISM.		
	Anglo-Catholicism : a Short Treatise on the Theory of the English Church, with remarks on its peculiarities ; the objections of Romanists and Dissenters ; its practical defects ; its present position ; its future prospects ; and the duties of its Members. By William Gresley, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield	47

ART.	PAGE
IV. THE GREEK CHURCH—THE ISRAELITES—AND THE PEOPLE OF RUSSIA.	
1. La Russia en 1839. Par Le Marquis de Custine.	
2. La Salle d'Armes. Par Alexandre Dumas.	
3. La Maitre d'Armes. Par le M ^{me}	69
V. THE AGE WE LIVE IN.	
England's Trust, and other Poems. By Lord John Manners	99
VI. THE CONSERVATIVE ADMINISTRATION,	
1. The Factory System. By W. Cooke Taylor, LL.D.	
2. Free Trade, with reference to its Effects upon the Operative Classes. Briefly Considered by Humanitas. Dedicated by Permission to the Society for the Protection of Agriculture.	
3. The Labourer's Friend	126
VII. FABER'S SACRED CALENDAR OF PROPHECY.	
The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy; or, a Dissertation on the Prophecies which treat of the Grand Period of Seven Times, and especially of its Second Moiety, or the Latter Three Times and a Half. By G. Stanley Faber	148
VIII. A NEW SPIRIT OF THE AGE.	
A New Spirit of the Age. Edited by R. H. Horne, Author of "Orion"	161
IX. CONINGSBY; OR, THE NEW GENERATION.	
Coningsby; or, the New Generation. By B. Disraeli, Esq., M.P., Author of "Contarini Fleming"	175

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

The Sees of Bangor and St. Asaph	191
The Dissenters' Chapels Bill	193
Mr. Bickersteth and the Scotch Schismatics	197
The Reformation Society	202
Scripture Readers	204
The Bishop of London's Pastoral Letter	205
The Ecclesiastical Courts Bill	206
Church Societies	208

GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in the Church of Rome, contrary to Holy Scriptures, and to the Faith and Practice of the Church of Christ, through the First Five Centuries . . .	209
Reppendune. A Moral Rhyme. By the Rev. J. Jones . . .	212
The Wooden Walls of England in Danger	214
The Sabbath Companion; being Essays on First Principles of Christian Faith and Practice, designed especially for the Use of Young Persons. By Thomas Dale, M.A.	214
Delineation of Roman Catholicism; drawn from the authentic and acknowledged Standards of the Church of Rome	215
A Letter, respectfully addressed to the Right Hon. Sir R. Peel, on the Restoration of Suffragan Bishops	217
The Anglican Church, the Creature and the Slave of the State . . .	218
The Sacred History of Man, with other Poems	220
Mesmerism and its Opponents	222
On the Choral Service of the Anglo-Catholic Church	222
The Psalter and Canticles in the Morning and Evening Services of the Church of England, divided and pointed for Chanting . . .	222
The Seven Penitential Psalms, in Verse, being Specimens of a New Version of the Psalter	227
A Guide to Life Assurance. With Directions for Effecting a Policy . .	224
A Course of Lectures suitable to the Times, on the Contents of the Book of Common Prayer. By the Rev. F. Dusatoy . . .	224
A Pictorial Tour in the Mediterranean, including Malta, Dalmatia, Turkey, Asia-Minor, Grecian Archipelago, Egypt, Nubia, Greece, Ionian Islands, Sicily, Italy, and Spain. By J. H. Allan . . .	225
Essays and Poems. By E. F. Roberts	227
The Hope that is in us. A Poem	227
Horse-shoe Nails; or, New Ideas on Old Subjects	227
The Distinction between Instinct and Reason	227
Principles of Education practically considered, with an Especial Reference to the Present State of Female Education in England . .	228
Hydropathy: the Theory, Principles, and Practice of the Water Cure. By E. Johnson, M.D.	229
The Old Church Clock	230
The Child's Book of Homilies	232
The Young Composer; or, Progressive Exercises in English Composition. By J. Cornwell	233

	PAGE
A Letter in Defence of those Members of the Church of England who hold that not all the Baptized, but as many as are led by the Spirit of God, are the Sons of God	234
Elements of Church History. By D. Welsh, D.D.	235
The Doctrine of Changes, as applicable both to the Institutions of Social Life and to the Progressive Order of Nature	236
Sermons preached in St. Mary's Episcopal Chapel, Dumfries. By the Rev. W. P. McFarquhar	237
Practical Sermons preached in Hanover Chapel, Regent-street. By the Rev. G. D. Hill	237
A Survey of the Holy Land: its Geography, History, and Destiny; designed to elucidate the Imagery of Scripture, and Demonstrate the Fulfilment of Prophecy. By J. T. Bannister	239
Altars prohibited by the Church of England	240
Bell's Outline Compositions from the Liturgy	240
Jerusalem and its Environs. By W. H. Bartlett	241
The Theses of Erastus, touching Excommunication	241
The Cistercian Saints of England: St. Stephen Harding	242
The Family of St. Richard the Saxon; St. Richard, King; St. Winibald, Bishop; St. Walburga, Virgin, Abbess; St. Winibald, Abbot	242
St. Augustine of Canterbury, Apostle of the English	242
The Order of Daily Service, Vol. II.	247
Conciones Basilicæ on the Second Advent	248
A Little Treatise demonstrating, from its Internal Evidences, the Divine Origin of the Holy Scriptures	249
The History of the Church of Scotland, from the Reformation to the Present Time. By T. Stephen	249
The Religious Life and Opinions of Frederick William III., King of Prussia	250
A Word in Season. By the Rev. J. Hooper	252
A Defence of the Ancient British Church	256
Confirmation: Scriptural, Apostolical, Primitive	256

CONTENTS.

ART.		PAGE
I. APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION—EPISCOPACY—AND PRIESTHOOD.		
1.	The Scriptural Evidence of the Apostolic Ministry, and Tradition of the Church Catholic. By Henry Phibbs Fry, A.B., of St. George's, Hobart Town.	
2.	Notes on the Episcopal Polity of the Holy Catholic Church. With some Account of the Development of the Modern Religious Systems. By Thomas William Marshall, B.A.	
3.	Dialogus Divi Johanni Chrysostomi de Sacerdotio. The Treatise of John Chrysostom on the Priesthood. Translated by Edward G. Marsh, M.A.	
4.	Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche.	257
II. EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS FOR THE PEOPLE.		
1.	Rapport Complet de M. Thiers, sur la loi de l'Instruction Secondaire.	
2.	L'Etat, l'Eglise et l'Enseignement. Par M. A. De Lamartine, Deputé de Mâcon.	
3.	Réponse à M. De Lamartine à l'occasion de son écrit l'Etat, l'Eglise et l'Enseignement. Par Chapuys Montlaville, Député.	305
III. PARTIAL DERANGEMENT OF THE MIND IN SUPPOSED CONNEXION WITH RELIGION.		
	Essays on Partial Derangement of the Mind in Supposed Connexion with Religion. By the late John Cheyne, M.D., F.R.S.E., M.R.I.J.	346

IV. THE FOUNDER AND FOLLOWERS OF TRAPPISM.

- Vie de Rancé. Par Monsieur Le Vicomte de Chateaubriand. 362

V. THE GOSPEL BEFORE THE AGE.

- The Gospel before the Age ; or, Christ with Nicodemus.
Being an Exposition for the Times. By the Rev.
Robert Montgomery, M.A. 391

VI. POPERY THE ENEMY AND THE FALSIFIER OF SCRIPTURE.

1. Lettre Encyclique du Pape Gregoire XVI. "Archives du Christianisme," No. XI., Juin 8, 1844.
2. Circular Letter from his Holiness the Pope. The "English Churchman," June 20, 1844.
3. Declaration of the [Roman] Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Coadjutors in Great Britain.
4. A Brief Reply to the Declaration of the [Roman] Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Coadjutors in Great Britain. 406

VII. VIGILANTIUS AND HIS TIMES.

- Vigilantius and his Times. By the Rev. W. S. Gilly, D.D. 448

VIII. IRELAND AND THE IRISH.

1. Memoranda of Irish Matters, by Obscure Men of Good Intention.
2. Speech of Viscount Bernard, M.P., on Mr. Ward's Motion in the House of Commons. August 2, 1843.
3. Ireland before and after the Union with Great Britain. By R. M. Martin, Esq.
4. The Truths of Protestantism Contrasted with the Errors of Popery ; and the Character of Popery as illustrated in Past and Present Times.
5. How will Peel treat Ireland?—an Address to the Catholics of Ireland. By Verus. 458

ECCLESIASTICAL REPORT.

The Bishop of London and his Detractors	482
The Bishops of Gloucester and Exeter'	486
The Welsh Sees	488
The Cambridge Camden Society	490
Case of the Rev. J. Shore	490
The Church Patronage Society	492
The Harvest	493

GENERAL LITERATURE.

Persecutions of Popery : Historical Narratives of the most Remarkable Persecutions occasioned by the Intolerance of the Church of Rome. By Frederick Shoberl	495
The Parent's High Commission	501
Illustrations of the Tragedies of Sophocles, from the Greek, Latin, and English Poets, with an Introductory Essay. By J. F. Boyes, St. John's College, Oxford	502
The Historian's Common-place Book and Companion ; consisting of a Key and Tabular Arrangements. By the Writer of "Lessons in Ancient History"	503
A Letter upon the Subject of Confirmation, addressed to the Little Ones of his Flock. By an English Priest	503
The Religion of Ancient Britain ; or, a Succinct Account of the Several Religious Systems which have obtained in this Island from the Earliest Times to the Norman Conquest. By G. Smith, F.A.S.	504
Authenticated Report of the Discussion which took place between the Rev. John Venn and the Rev. James Waterworth, in St. Peter's School-room, Hereford	505
Rhymes for a Royal Nursery	505

The Lyria Ecclesiastica; consisting of Voluntaries, Introits, Chants, Services, Anthems, Sanctuses, &c. By the Rev. Joshua Fawcett, M.A.	506
Cambridge Prize Essays. The Christian System Vindicated against the more Popular Forms of Modern Infidelity. By the Rev. Daniel Moore, M.A., Minister of Christ Chapel, St. John's Wood	507
The Jasper Clouded and the Rainbow round the Throne. A Farewell Sermon. By the Rev. Aris Willmott.	508
Protestant Missions in Bengal. By J. J. Weitbrecht	508
The Duties of the Christian Ministry; with a View of the Primitive and Apostolical Church, and the Danger of Departing from its Doctrine and Discipline. By the Rev. B. Bailey, M.A., Senior Colonial Chaplain of the Island of Ceylon	509
Life in Athens, in the Time of Pericles; Illustrative of Ancient and Modern Democracy. From the German of Von Wessenberg	509
The First Voyage of Rodolph the Voyager. By "G. D. L."	150
Fifty Pictorial Illustrations of the Life of our Lord. From the Old Masters, as Pictures defining lessons for Classes, accompanied by a General Outline of the Gospel History. By R. Mimpriss	510
1. Six Thousand Years Ago; or, the Works of Oreation. Illustrated by Mrs. Best.	510
2. Naboth the Jezreelite, and other Poems. By Anne Flinders	510

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.

JULY, MDCCCXLIV.

- ART. I.—*The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments : a Translation of the First Book of the Rationale Divinorum Officiorum.* Written by W. DURANDUS, sometime Bishop of Mende. With an Introductory Essay, Notes, and Illustrations, by the Rev. J. M. NEALE, B.A. and the Rev. B. WEBB, B.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge. Leeds: Green. London: Rivington. Cambridge: Stevenson. 1843.
2. *Hierurgia ; or the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. With Notes and Dissertations, elucidating its Doctrines and Ceremonies.* By DANIEL ROCK, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Dolman.
 3. *Aunt Elinor's Lectures on Architecture.* Dedicated to the Ladies of England. London: Rivington. 1843.
 4. *Practical Remarks on some of the Minor Accessories to the Services of the Church ; with Hints on the preparation of Altar-cloths, Pede-cloths, and other Ecclesiastical Furniture : addressed to Ladies and Churchwardens.* By GILBERT T. FRENCH. Leeds: Green. London: Rivington. 1844.

THE press now teems with publications on Church ornaments and vestments, from the graver dissertations of the Camden Society and the Roman Clergy, to Aunt Elinor's Lectures to the Ladies and the Practical Hints for the employment of their fingers on Ecclesiastical furniture by Gilbert French. There is a fashion, or a rage, as it is called, in such things—and we suppose it must have its course till it has either exhausted itself, or is diverted into another channel by some other fashion springing up, and becoming, in like manner, the rage for a

season. But these things are signs and indications of the bent of the public mind at the time, and ought to be taken advantage of, both in the hope of directing into a right channel exertions which seem to have arisen from mere random impulse in many instances, and to have no determined aim, and to be under no regular control; and also in the endeavour to extract from the fleeting impulse some permanent good, and, before it has passed away, ascertain the truth which is to be cherished and the error which is to be avoided, while palpable instances of both are before our eyes, and the understandings of all are more open to enquiry, from all being more or less directly interested in the investigation.

The taste for antiquarian research in general sprang up many years ago, and was evidenced in various publications—in Hope's "Costume and Furniture of Greece and Rome"—in Britton's "Architectural Works"—in Meyrick's "Ancient Armour," &c. And the antiquarian bias of Sir Walter Scott's mind, which peeped out in all his works, and in his later works became their predominant feature, gave a sensible tone to the public taste, and rendered that acquaintance with by-gone habits, and practices, and manners, which had formerly been repudiated in polished society, as belonging only to the tenants of the cloister, to relieve disappointment, or while away the hours of tedium—is now become popular, and the elegant occupation of the young, the fashionable, and the gay; and is ministered to in all the most splendid and attractive forms by which the press can give perpetuity and diffusion to the productions of the pencil and the pen. Truly the times are changed since our early days, when the *Gentleman's Magazine* held the monopoly of antiquarian information, and Mr. Urban sent forth, from St. John's-gate, his oracular diota concerning cairns and canoes—concerning stycas, mancuses, and sceattas—in style as dry and uninviting as its readers are supposed to have been.

When a taste for antiquities had arisen, it was to be expected that it would extend to ecclesiastical antiquities, and that especial attention would be paid to this branch of the enquiry; since, in addition to the interest which it has in common with all the other branches, the Church and its past history has peculiar claims to attention; as presenting more abundant materials for investigation, and these themselves of a deeper interest, and terminating not in the gratification of curiosity, but having respect to heavenly things, and followed by consequences which may be permanent—may be eternal. For as, when religion lays hold on a man, it lays hold on his whole

being, and everything which he possesses is, with himself, dedicated to God; so the Church, being an institution for the service of God, everything done therein is done as to God; and nothing done in the Church is indifferent; all things are either well pleasing to God, or they are an offence to Him whom we profess to worship and serve. And in reference to ourselves also, as the Church is an instrument in God's hand for the blessing of man, and its forms and ordinances are the channels for his grace, it is most important that these should be what God has appointed, that they may be truly sacramental, and not of human invention, to divert the intended blessing, and hinder rather than aid our devotions.

And in addition to the superior claims which ecclesiastical antiquities inherently possess, beyond the other branches of antiquarian research, the public taste has received a bias in that direction from that party which has made so much stir at Oxford: the effect of which has been extended and prolonged, not only through those who have professedly advocated or openly resisted the movements of this party, but in self-defence, and by a vast number of quiet Churchmen, who had no desire to mingle in party warfare, but were simply anxious, in so important a matter, to keep themselves in the right. Party strife has for the present, in a good degree, subsided; but the necessity for enquiry, to come at the truth, still continues to be felt, to settle satisfactorily the questions which have been raised, and prevent a recurrence of similar scenes.

There is at the present time a comparative calm upon the minds of men, which is favourable to the discussion of these questions—a calm which may enable all to examine with patience, and weigh with due deliberation, those points concerning doctrine, worship, and discipline, the mere mention of which has of late been wont to kindle them into fury, and the discussion of which threatened at one time a disruption in the Church of England, as much more deplorable than that which has taken place in Scotland, as the questions are more deep, and permanent, and vital—and the parties more numerous, and learned, and influential. And while, as friends of the Church, we rejoice in this comparative lull which has taken place of the storm, we think that it would be deceiving ourselves to regard it as other than a temporary calm. The questions have not been disposed of—men's minds have not been set at rest. They have been alarmed on all sides by the fearful consequences which it became evident to all must at once ensue, if these points of controversy were pushed to an immediate issue; and by tacit consent they have, for the present,

receded on every hand, unsatisfied, but deferring the issue to another opportunity.

It has been clearly shown, by what has taken place, that the rulers of the Church, and in the University, are aware of the extent of error which needs correction; but that they have dealt gently, and refrained from interfering, except where it could no longer be delayed, in the charitable hope that the errors would soon become manifest to the parties themselves. And it was also probable, from the youth of many, and from symptoms too often apparent and unmistakable, that the immediate exercise of authority would drive ardent and rash men to extremities, and force them to decide with incomplete information; and, coming to a hasty judgment, they might commit themselves to a line of conduct which, however much they might have reason to regret it in after life, would be, in most cases, absolutely irrevocable.

In all questions concerning ancient doctrines, or practices, or forms, our first temptation is, to look to Rome for deciding all questions in which Protestants are not directly at issue with her; and the fear is, lest, having overcome, as we imagine, our Protestant prejudices, we should fall into the snare of taking the judgment of Rome in all things, or, at the least, in all those things against which the Reformers have not directly and unequivocally pronounced their judgment. And when we thus far dally with Rome, it is possible we may be further seduced into agreement; it is possible that an ingenious man may be able to explain away differences which seem irreconcilable to ordinary minds—he may even persuade himself that the Thirty-nine Articles do not disagree with the canons of the Council of Trent. And when we remember the lofty pretensions to unity, unchangeableness, and Catholicity which are held out by Rome, such a person may be doing all this under the delusive idea that he is become more orthodox and more Catholic.

It is necessary, therefore, that all, and especially the young, should be put upon their guard, and be enjoined to furnish themselves with some scale or standard whereby they may test the principles and practices of the Church of Rome, many of which are confessedly not to be found in Scripture, or in the records of the primitive Church. And the more so, because Rome, in cases such as these, is wont to carry things with a very high hand, and insist upon it that she herself is the standard to which all other Churches are bound to conform; and that, even in appealing to Scripture, or the early Church, her practice shows how these are to be interpreted and understood—how

they are now understood by the Catholic Church, to which no private person can safely or wisely refuse to conform ; for everything found there is assumed to be right, until it is proved to be wrong. And we wish to avail ourselves of this pause in the movement, and of the present quiet in the Church, in bringing before our readers as many of these questions as our time and space will permit, that we may calmly examine them, and endeavour to ascertain by what principles each question is to be decided. And the question to which we would, on this occasion, direct the attention of our readers is that of symbolism and symbols, or "the sacramental principle," as it has been loosely and indefinitely denominated by the Oxford writers. And we would first enquire what is really sought for by the introduction of symbols into the Church, and what are the true and legitimate desires in the hearts of those pious men who are requiring of the Church of England a greater reverence for forms and outward show, and a nearer approximation to the gorgeous and sensually-attractive ceremonial of the Church of Rome. And, on the other hand, would enquire how far we are warranted in protesting against any further approximation than we find already conceded and established in our canons and ritual ; and whether any further concession may not turn devotion into a mere round of idle ceremonies with minds of the formal class, or with minds of another class, and such as cannot be satisfied with outward forms alone, but crave, and may be tempted to feign, a living reality, within and beyond the form—may turn the worship of God into the worship of a thing, and so generate gross palpable idolatry.

All men are impressible, to a great degree, through the senses ; and in this point of view appropriate symbols, and even mere magnificence, may kindle devotion ; and, where it already exists, may heighten its rapture, or deepen its pathos. But then the symbols must be regarded as the secondary, not the primary, consideration—they must be held subsidiary to worship, and not as taking its place—they must ever lead to God, and present him, above, beyond, distinct from all created things ; and, while exalting our thoughts concerning him, leaving him still uppermost in our minds, and above our highest thoughts, or the symbols will become hindrances of, and substitutes for, not helps to, our devotion. But it is very observable that men differ from each other in their susceptibility, and the degree in which they are impressed by these sensible objects ; and the kind of objects which help the devotions of one man may hinder the devotions of another—one may thus require, another reject, such adjuncts of devotion.

And these different effects do not in all cases arise from prejudice, or from wrong associations, but are, in most instances, to be ascribed to a natural difference of constitution ; and this, observable not in different individuals only, but in different races of men. It may be affirmed, for instance, of the Italians, that their senses require to be engaged, at their devotions, in a greater degree than any other European nation ; that not only is their whole soul drawn out in music, painting, &c., when they are engaged in these arts, but that they require these, or similar arts, which appeal to the senses, in order to draw out their whole soul for worship when they are engaged in devotion. But it may with equal truth be affirmed, that the fact is quite otherwise in the north of Europe ; and that the Germans, for instance, in their devotions, seek for abstraction of mind, and avoid any appeals to the senses, as interfering with that spiritual communion between God, who is a Spirit, and the spirits of men, which is to be regarded as the highest act of worship and the end of all devotion. Such general assertions as these, of course, will have exceptions, in numerous individuals, among the nations of the north and the south. The truth, we assert, is this—that there is a difference in men and in nations in these respects ; and that we may not draw such sweeping inferences from the abundance or absence of outward signs of worship, as to condemn either party on that account, we must, on the one hand, avoid coming to the uncharitable conclusion, that where such forms are introduced as we may not require, there can be no spiritual worship among those who require them ; and we must also protest against those who would call our devotions cold, merely because we have not all the forms and adjuncts to which they may have been accustomed. We are sure that in the north, as well as in the south, there are minds of such a temperament as to be greatly assisted and strengthened in their devotions by the help of symbols and forms—it is our duty to consult the good of such persons in tolerating these things, so far as they are not pernicious to us and prejudicial to them, though we may not require such helps. Toleration with each other, in matters that are important to one party and indifferent to the other, may be reasonably required—may be charitably yielded. If it be expected that all men shall adopt and count of the same value things which are not of the same importance to all men, what can result from such intolerance but affectation, and hypocrisy, and rancour, all rendered only the more deep and deadly from being secret and insidious ?

We know, from the correspondence between Jewell and Hooper, and many similar sources, that this kind of toleration

was evinced by the English Reformers respecting many of the practices which had crept into the Church, and to which people had become attached by long use. Where these practices were not based upon false doctrine, and tended not to superstition, these wise and charitable fathers of the Church let them remain, trusting to time, and the inculcation of sound doctrine, for preventing such practices from degenerating into superstition, and for clearing them of any false notions which foolish men had attached to such things. It would be a gross libel upon our fathers, to assert that all the practices of the Church which they suffered to remain, they therefore adopted, and adopted in the same sense and to the same extent as these practices are understood and applied by the Roman Catholics of the present day. The English Reformers carefully defined the meaning of all the things which they really adopted; and where they have not been thus careful, it may be inferred that they held the thing to be secondary, or even indifferent, and that liberty might be safely allowed to modify or dispense with it, according to circumstances.

Many, even of those things which are enjoined in the rubrics and canons, are of this secondary nature, and enjoined for the sake of order and decency, or because they have been ordinarily used on such occasions; not as sacramental—not as of the essence of the worship—not as of divine appointment. The surplices which students are to wear in worshipping, by the seventeenth canon; the reverent deportment of all other worshippers, enjoined in the eighteenth; and the surplices, hoods, and tippetts to be worn by those who may minister, by the fifty-eighth canon—all stand on the same footing of decency, comeliness, and ordinary propriety; nothing like a sacramental character is attributed to these things. And, forasmuch as they thought it right to retain the use of the sign of the cross in baptism—and this sign had been more especially turned into superstition and idolatry by the Church of Rome—they devote a long canon to their explaining the exact sense in which it was meant to be used in baptism—that it “is no part of the substance of that sacrament.....doth neither add anything to the virtue and perfection of baptism, nor, being omitted, doth detract anything from the effect and substance of it.” (Canon xxx.) So that they were careful to guard even this, the most venerable, the most universal of the practices of the Church, and though employed in the administration of a sacrament, from being regarded as sacramental in itself, or from coming at all into competition with the two divinely instituted sacraments of the Christian Church.

The Puritans misunderstood, or misrepresented, these principles of the English Church, as if they arose from a leaning towards Popery, when all their acts showed that our Reformers drew the clearest distinction between the sacraments or institutions of divine appointment, and therefore necessary to salvation, and those signs of "due and lowly reverence done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; testifying, by these outward ceremonies and gestures, their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment, that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world." (Canon xviii.) If the Puritans had rightly understood this, they would not have vilified men who set a far higher value upon the institutions of Christ than they themselves did—who ever insisted upon the necessity of resting the sacraments upon the word of God and Christ's own appointment—and asserted uniformly that practices which did not rest on that foundation are not to be considered as of the same class with the sacraments, however important they may be in their own kind, or however extensively they may have prevailed in the Church: and they would then have seen the folly of requiring scriptural authority for things which confessedly disclaimed any such obligation.

And many of those who call themselves Anglo-Catholics err in the opposite extreme, under a similar misunderstanding; and, from assuming that whatever was permitted was also enjoined, and of an equal authority with doctrines and sacraments, they have given to practices which were understood to be conventional and temporary the weight of divine institutions and a perpetual obligation. Those desires which are legitimate—which seek, by means of forms, to attain greater unity, order, and propriety in the worship of the Church, may be gratified without following the evil example set by the Roman Catholics, who have exalted things of human invention to the level of sacraments, the inevitable tendency of which is to degrade the sacraments to the level of human inventions in some and produce idolatry in others.

No true Churchman will defend the acts of the iconoclasts of ancient times, nor the still more wanton and barbarous desecrations perpetrated by Knox and his followers in Scotland at the Reformation, and by the Puritans in England at a later time; and these latter no Anglican is at all tempted to defend, seeing the perpetrators of these outrages were the enemies of his Church; and, had they the power, would have as heartily demolished the Church itself, as they broke down the carved work thereof with their axes and hammers.

Yet, without justifying in the least the barbarism of those zealots, it should be borne in mind that there had been abuses on the other side which provoked their zeal, and became so many incentives to their rage and fury. There is an evil great enough to justify the desecration of hallowed things when they are become infected with it; and if sacred things, however good in themselves, and however legitimately brought in at the first, have become so perverted to idolatry that it can only be put away by destroying the things, then let the things be destroyed—at any sacrifice let idolatry be destroyed. The gold of which the calf was made was as good gold after it became an idol as before, but Moses would not use it for any other service; he ground it to powder, and made the idolators drink it for their sin.

We have before our eyes practices among the Roman Catholics which ought not to be tolerated by any Church which knows the truth; we have had experience among ourselves, in cases like that of Ware, how a weak and headstrong man, taking up crude notions concerning obsolete practices, and trying to force them upon an ill-informed and undisciplined people, may provoke hostility, not only to himself, but to the Church itself, which all the wise councils and conciliatory recommendations of the bishops may fail in attempting to assuage. And we very much fear, that if something is not done to inform men's minds better on these subjects, and an exciting cause of a more general and extensive interest should arise, we may find that the boasted civilization of this day will not suffice to exempt us from a repetition of the well-nigh forgotten excesses and barbarous havoc of the Iconoclasts and the Puritans.

In the publications which we have prefixed to this article, and that merely as one sample from numbers of the four different classes, there is no attempt at giving principles—they only give examples or illustrations, assuming that whatever has been is right. And then, because men have been at fault for principles, yet have wished to say something in favour of the practices they have found prevalent, and have therefore exercised their ingenuity in devising some meaning in the practice, these fancies, or mere guesses, are obtruded upon us in place of principles, and as traditions of the Church. We have not put Mr. Lewis's book on Kilpeck Church among those we refer to, because it might be thought an unfair sample, as many of the other writers disown him, and refuse to be bound by his dicta. The editors of *Durandus*, for example, in speaking of Mr. Lewis, say—

“We may mention the arbitrary way in which he determines on

things which are to be symbolized, and then violently endeavours to find their expected types. This is quite at variance with the practice of any sober symbolist.....Indeed, while Mr. Lewis insists strongly on the symbolizing of facts, he does not succeed in grasping any general principle, any more than he sees the difficulty there is in the way of our receiving his supposition, of an intention to symbolize from the first."

And in a note they say—

"It is with pain that we have spoken of Mr. Lewis at all, because every Ecclesiologist owes him a debt, for his great boldness in turning the public attention to the subject of symbolism. Yet we believe that a prejudice has been excited by him against that subject which it will be hard to get over; for we are constrained to say, that greater absurdities were never printed than some which have appeared in his book."
—*Pref. xxxi.*

We say so, too, merely including all these writers, together with Mr. Lewis, in our estimate, and especially Durandus, whom these gentlemen have been at the pains of editing, though he was a man so ignorant, that his attempts to give the etymology of the words he uses are nearly as often wrong as right, and sometimes most grotesquely absurd. Such as "history is derived from *ιστορειν*, which is to *gesticulate*: whence gesticulators (that is, players) are called *histriones*." (8). For our parts, we cannot perceive in what respects Durandus was a more sober symbolist than Mr. Lewis, or that he succeeded better in grasping general principles, or was more consistent than Mr. Lewis in applying them to the facts. But there was a vast difference in the station of the men; Durandus was a bishop—Mr. Lewis is a layman. And we suspect that if these things were reversed, and, above all, if Mr. Lewis had written in Latin, and Durandus "in the vulgar tongue," these gentlemen might have formed a different estimate, and might even have given the palm of superiority to Mr. Lewis. It is wonderful what excellences men discover in Latin of the thirteenth century written by a bishop! Take for instance, the mystery of the weathercock, concerning which thus writeth Durandus—

"The cock which is placed thereon representeth preachers. For the cock, in the deep watches of the night, divideth the hours thereof; with his song he arouseth the sleepers; he foretelleth the approach of day; but first he stirreth himself up to crow, by the striking of his wings. Behold ye these things mystically, for not one is there without meaning. The sleepers be the children of this world, lying in sins. The cock is the company of preachers, which do preach sharply, do stir up the sleepers to cast away the works of darkness, crying—'Woe

to the sleepers : awake thou that sleepest :' which also do foretell the coming of the light, when they preach the day of judgment and future glory. But wisely, before they preach unto others, they do rouse themselves, by virtues, from the sleep of sin, and do chasten their bodies. ' Whence (saith the apostle) I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection.' The same also do turn themselves to meet the wind, when they bravely do contend against and resist the rebellious by admonition and argument, lest they should seem to flee when the wolf cometh. The iron rod upon which the cock sitteth showeth the straightforward speech of the preacher—that he doth not speak from the spirit of man, but according to the Scriptures of God : as it is said —' If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.' In that this rod is placed above the cross, it is shown that the words of Scripture be consummated and confirmed by the cross ; whence our Lord said in his passion, ' It is finished.' " (p. 200).

How the rod, which is placed *above* the cross, is *consummated* by the cross which stands *below* it, Durandus showeth not. But the whole book consists of such rambling disjointed stuff as this, unworthy of any other audience than ranters in a barn. Yet many, we suppose, may think it excellent, because there is a text for every assertion ; though the text and the assertion may have no better agreement than " fist to eye," according to the German proverb. Still this weathercock is a favourable specimen of Durandus, rather than otherwise, and, as such, is twice referred to by the editors in their Introduction ; first, as an instance of *intentional symbolism* (p. lvii.) ; and again, to slip in the inference " that Durandus, S. Isidore, Belet, and the rest, seem to quote from *some canons of Church symbolism, now unknown to us.*" (p. lxxv.) Certainly there have been sundry absurd canons, but that any warranting such trifling as this have been framed we doubt, and shall continue to doubt, till they are actually produced. Many an old woman in a nursery would equal such symbolism as this.

We should not think the trifler Durandus worthy of a thought or a line, were it not that his writings have been a favourite plaything with the Romanists, and that he is put forward now as a sort of fly-trap, as one of the many artifices whereby light and unsettled spirits may be attracted, and, from want of heed, may at length find themselves within the meshes of Rome. We do not accuse the editors of this volume of the duplicity of any such intention, but we suspect that they lie under a stronger bias, and are in greater danger than they themselves are conscious of. When we observe that the gross ignorance of Durandus is scarcely noticed by them, or slurred over with the passing observation, " this is, of course, a false derivation" (page 32, note) ; and yet, find that in the far more important

points of symbolism, and in the mystical signification of things, which require the greatest judgment, the word of this ignorant man is received by them with unhesitating credulity. Durandus blunders continually in the very names of the things which he is speaking of, yet men most unaccountably give him credit for understanding the meaning of the things themselves.

But all the mistakes of Durandus tell in favour of Romanism—none of them against it; for he lived at a time when the sectarianism of Rome was at its height, and her partizans had not then been shamed into decency by the light of the revival of letters, nor terrified by the forebodings of a coming Reformation, so as to bestir themselves to set their house in order. Yet all the things here mentioned are spoken of as *Catholic* practices, suppressing the qualifying adjective *Roman* altogether, and this by clergymen of the Reformed English Church. This is scarcely candid or consistent. But, alas! things are looked at through a false medium, and heightened by a colouring of imagination, and are mellowed, chastened, and hallowed by the hand of time which has passed upon them, so that all the accompanying evils are lost sight of, or, if seen at all, are only regarded as dust in the balance. And it is the master-stroke of the policy of Rome, that all her practices, while professing to be of the Spirit of God, are attractive and seductive to the mind of man, and lay a strong hold on the imagination. She has addressed herself to the senses with consummate art, and has succeeded in constructing a system which is all but irresistible—is only to be successfully resisted by knowledge of the word of God, and of God himself, as revealed in Jesus Christ. “They overcame by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony.”

Nothing can more clearly evince the Romanist tendency of these things than the fact, that Dr. Rock has published the work which we name at the beginning of this article avowedly, in order to forward this tendency, and place the Roman Church in such an inviting attitude as to induce and almost compel men, who have advanced the length of symbolism, to take the other little step which remains, and receive their representations of transubstantiation in the mass. For if the principle be admitted, that things become symbolic because men have so regarded them, or the Church has so declared, then are they symbolic *in the sense* in which they have been so declared, and transubstantiation of the elements must consequently be received also in the sense in which the Church has made that declaration. And if there be a sacramental principle in all things, as these writers are continually maintaining, then are

the sacraments themselves only a fuller development of the natural property of all things—not institutions of Christ, powerless in themselves, and made, by his appointment, channels for imparting to the Church supernatural gifts—the divine nature for regeneration, and heavenly grace and strength to use that new spiritual life unto the glory of God. But not only are both these parties unaware of all that is involved in the principles which they profess to hold—more than all this, they are deceived by the ambiguity of the words they employ; and one party laying hold of one sense, the other party, understanding things differently, is really speaking of different things. There are three senses in which symbolism may be understood—the figurative, the typical, and the sacramental. The figurative or imaginative sense is that which is meant by Durandus and his translators, and is of universal application—at least, to the degree and in the sense in which hieroglyphics are. In this sense, either from its inherent properties, or from some conventional understanding about it, an object suggests an idea to the mind, or strengthens it when pre-existing. For instance, in Durandus, “the glass windows in a church are holy Scriptures,” &c. “Also by the windows the senses of the body are signified,” &c. (pp. 28, 29). But the editors of Durandus say, in their Introduction, “Firstly, of windows. The primary idea shadowed forth.....is the saying of our Lord to his disciples, ‘Ye are the light of the world,’” &c. (lxxxix.) There are three perfectly distinct ideas said to be conveyed by the same symbol, of which we will only remark, that the third is not very obvious, and we suppose is to be ranked with *lucus a non lucendo*; for the use of all windows is to admit light *from without*, not to diffuse light *from within*, which we conceive ought to be their use if they symbolize the fact of the Church enlightening the world. We say, however, that as there are here three meanings, it is evident that symbolism here is only meant to designate the fanciful or conventional idea which men receive from any object. This low view of symbols is not only objectionable as being merely fanciful, but as being utterly insufficient for the purpose for which it is adduced, and a foundation too weak and variable to sustain a structure of such grave importance as men seek to build upon it. For who is to decide which of these three meanings given to windows is the correct one? On what *principle* do these meanings rest, and what *principle* is there to prevent any other person from assigning three other meanings? We know not any other principle than common sense which would guide a poor architect in his endeavours to carry out in practice such ideas as

these, and common sense must lead him to reject the third idea concerning windows, as contrary to the doctrine of which they are said to be the symbol or explanation; notwithstanding the bold, but gratuitous assertion, that this is "the primary idea shadowed forth in every one of the styles of architecture," and that "we must retain it as the groundwork, or we shall be in danger of mistaking the true meaning of ancient church architects." (lxxxix.) For those who do retain it must first have got rid of a more valuable thing—common sense.

The sacramental notion concerning symbols, which is that generally entertained by the Romanists, is the very opposite of the figurative or fanciful; for it is based upon the assumed *reality* of all forms and objects of a symbolic character. Yet, by that strange inconsistency which we often observe in the meeting of extremes, the figurative symbolists unconsciously adopt into their system much of the Romanist reality, and therefore the latter expect them very soon to go all lengths with them in the sacramental principle; and the Romanists, who ought, by the sacramental principle, to have rejected everything figurative, have adopted wholesale all the conceits of Durandus, and of every other fanciful writer upon the subject, provided only that these conceits fall in with, or do not seem to contravene, the Roman system. But many of the explanations which they receive do really contravene their system, and are in themselves contradictory; and these give them little trouble, for they are salved over by blind obsequiousness to the clergy.

The sacramental notion concerning symbols does contain a principle, but it is a principle which does not apply to them *as symbols*, and therefore becomes as vague and unsatisfactory as the figurative notion; because it does not apply in every case without exception, and applies with greater force in some cases than others, supposing it to be true in any case. For the principle being, that things thus employed, thus used as symbols, have a force and efficacy in them, which other things of the same kind have not, it follows that the things themselves have undergone some change by being so employed, or that a sacramental influence is imparted through them to those who thus employ them. And in either case it is the presence of the power of God; divine power alone can change the nature of the thing, or impart, through a mere thing, a sacramental or divine influence. But, this being the case, man cannot command the presence of God—man cannot impart at will a sacramental character to a thing by calling it sacramental: it needs the appointment of God to make a thing sacramental,

because, in order to its being so, his presence is necessary. And none will be absurd enough to carry this the whole length of symbolism, or say that God is present when the windows of a church are of one shape, and is not present when they are of another shape—that he is present in cruciform churches, and not so in those that are square. The principle evidently will not apply.

It remains, therefore, that the typical is the only true notion concerning symbols which will meet all the conditions of the case, and stand every test. All things are not typical or symbolic; for if it were so, none could be truly and exclusively so. But the greater number of things being not so, and nothing in its natural state being so, God hath selected certain things, and put them in certain forms, to constitute types of coming events, and taken certain things as sacramental to make them peculiar channels for imparting peculiar blessings of a spiritual and heavenly character. And this, not by a communication of a new nature or inherent virtue to the things, so as to render them anything like the talismans and charms or amulets of the heathen; but by spiritual grace, to be apprehended only by the spiritual, and that only through faith, and not by the bodily senses. Things in general are left to the taste, or fancy, or common sense of all mankind, while certain things are selected to be typical of spiritual things, or to become channels of imparting sacramental grace to the Church.

Looking at Church architecture and Church furniture in this sober way—regarding it in general as only matter of taste, and as becoming symbolic only in certain cases selected by God to convey some special instruction, or impart some peculiar blessing, we seem to arrive at a solution of many difficulties, a correction of many errors, and a source of much profitable instruction to the Church; and we cannot discover any other rational way of considering the subject.

God hath endowed all men with reason, and the capacity for distinguishing between right and wrong in *morals* and *conduct*; because any deviation *here* is a deviation from truth, such as will incur guilt and deserve punishment—for there cannot be two kinds of truth, and the deviation from truth is falsehood and actual crime. But it is not so in matters of taste. All men are not endowed with equal perceptions in this respect; some men appear to be totally incapable of distinguishing between true and false taste: and the capacity, even in those who have it most decidedly, is often much improved and greatly enlarged by assiduous cultivation.

And as with individuals, so with the arts themselves; looked

at as a whole, they have been improved by cultivation, but they began in what is familiarly termed genius. Men did not first lay down rules and principles, and then begin to write, and build, and paint; but in writing, and building, and painting, the men of talent showed themselves and they produced works which served as models for others: and then, from these works, men of inferior genius might deduce principles and rules which would enable them to do more than they could otherwise have done, and which principles would enable men of equal talents to surpass the works of their predecessors. Homer, in writing poetry, followed the impulse of genius, and left the "Iliad" as a work from which others may learn rules and principles of poetry.

There is no greater mystery in architecture than in any other art. They all minister to the wants and desires of man, and, to be acceptable, must become refined in proportion as mankind advance in refinement. Utility, or adaptation to the purpose for which things are intended, is the foundation of good taste in architecture, as in all other things. Utility, being kept constantly in view, will prevent the introduction of decorations which interfere with the primary use of the building, or which divert attention from the purpose which originated, and the end to be accomplished, or the service to which it will be dedicated. The same architect may build both churches and palaces, both equally good in their kind; but they will be good only in proportion as he remembers, in all his plans and decorations, that he is in the one case building a church, and in the other a palace, and gives play to the very different associations connected with the one and the other.

And among these associations it cannot be forgotten that God is to be honoured and his will is to be consulted in the erection of a church, that all things therein may promote and invigorate, and nothing may distract or deaden, the worship and service of Him; whereas in the erection of a palace we need only regard the taste and feeling of men. This brings in a new element, which is that which is meant by symbolism; and it raises the question, how we may honour God and consult his will in the matter, and assure ourselves that we are not dishonouring him and following our own wills, or a corrupt and depraved taste. It certainly would be acting thus wrongly, if we imitated heathen temples, however beautiful in themselves, when such imitations continually brought up heathen associations to our thoughts—or even if they turned aside our thoughts from the proper occupation of all our heart in the worship and service of God. The prohibition of idolatry in

the second commandment not only prohibits the gross idolatry which was prevalent in the time of Moses, but everything which is put in the place of God and turns us aside from him : and now, when we are worshippers in spirit, anything which distracts the spirit of a Christian congregation becomes, in their case, tantamount to a breach of the second commandment. God provided for this want, and guarded against this danger, in the typical and symbolical worship which was instituted for the children of Israel. He left not the forms to their taste and judgment, but prescribed them, in all their details, with great exactness ; and it was made as incumbent upon Moses to embody these instructions in the tabernacle which he built, as it was to obey any of the other commands which he received at the same time and under the same awful sanctions. Over and over again it is repeated—" See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount." And St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, refers to this as evincing God's providence in thus exactly prescribing the symbols of the Christian mysteries, and as a proof of the faithfulness of Moses in obeying most scrupulously that which the Lord had commanded. We might, therefore, infer, that if such symbols were required in Christian worship, they would be prescribed with equal minuteness in the New Testament, and would be given in command to us, as those of the Old were to Moses. But, so far from it, St. Paul teaches us, when commenting on the Mosaic ritual, that all these things had decayed, become obsolete, and were ready to vanish away. And his comments render it, in fact, impossible that he could have entertained the idea of their continuance, since he argues that the most important of all the symbols, and that which formed the crown of all the rest—to which they all had respect, and without which they had no point or meaning—the holy of holies and its furniture—is transferred to heaven ; and there, at that throne and mercy-seat, Christ, our High Priest, now intercedes for us. And this being removed, it does not appear how any of the others can be, with any propriety, admitted in the Church.

The most magnificent of temples was that built by Solomon at Jerusalem ; and Mr. Wilkins has supposed that it furnished the plan and proportions according to which some of the most remarkable of the heathen temples were constructed ; as those of Palmyra and Pæstum, and even the Parthenon. Solomon also built a palace, no doubt as magnificent in its kind as the temple was ; but there was this remarkable difference, that in building the palace he followed his own taste or fancy, but

in building the temple he had inspiration to guide him, for the plan of it had been revealed to his father David, and this plan he gave to Solomon, together with a charge to execute it, and great store of materials collected for that purpose. "Then David gave to Solomon, his son, the pattern of the porch," &c. ; "all this, said David, the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern..... be strong, and of good courage, and do it: fear not, nor be dismayed: for the Lord God, even my God, will be with thee: he will not fail thee, nor forsake thee, until thou hast finished all the work for the service of the house of the Lord." (1 Chron. xxviii. 11-20). This is what we understand by symbolism, and the authority we require for its adoption.

Symbolism, in its true sense, is nothing short of inspiration; it is God using *forms* to reveal spiritual truths, which truths are declared by *word* in other cases; and it requires the same presence of the Holy Spirit to express these truths by symbols, as to utter them in words. But the truth to be made known was Christ and the Church—a truth prefigured even in Adam and Eve, as declared by St. Paul (Eph. v. 32), and forming the substance of all succeeding revelations, whether verbal or symbolical. The full meaning of these things the prophets themselves could not know, as they are known in the Church, for not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things (1 Pet. i. 12); and we, having the reality, not only understand the symbols, but are able to dispense with them altogether. Both the tabernacle and the temple, in their various parts and the accompanying services, prefigured the coming realities of the Christian dispensation; as we are continually taught throughout the New Testament, and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews. And as, when the reality is come, we might infer that there would be no further use for the symbol, and as St. Paul speaks of the whole Jewish service as then decaying, waxing old, and ready to vanish away, so it requires stronger reasons than any which we have heard to convince us that such symbolism has any place at all in the Christian Church. Besides, what right have men, who stand up for the importance of symbols, to choose among them what symbols they will introduce, and omit the others? The symbols of the law are one whole, to be taken entire, or to be entirely omitted; those who contend for real sacrificial altars should, in consistency have a real victim, and fire and wood—they should slay the lamb again and sprinkle real blood, and burn the fat upon the altar; for it is with reference to the reality of these acts that the other symbols were ordered.

But the question cannot be put, or could not stand for a moment, on the high ground of the necessity of symbols in Christian worship; since, during the best ages of the Church, the Jewish temple and all its symbols had passed away, and for many generations following there were no Christian temples—no places in which symbolism could be developed. The Church passed through ages of persecution and consequent concealment, worshipping in private houses and catacombs; and it is curious that many of the symbols since introduced—such as lights, altar-tombs, incense, and bones of saints—are memorials of these hiding-places of the Church; and the ingenuity of man afterwards devised the older and more mysterious origin which has been assigned them. The necessity of lights, when men met underground for worship, and were constrained to use a sarcophagus for a table, and needed the odour of incense to purify the air, affords no reason for our continuing the same practices. The early Christians would have been but too happy in having the power of dispensing with these things, through toleration being afforded them in such Churches as ours. And the idea of the costly decorations and gorgeous apparel, which is the primary association with symbolism now, was out of the question with them—in fact, it was not thought of in the Church till after the time of Constantine. Yet no one can doubt that, during the three first centuries of the Church, devotion was at its highest pitch, and the most abundant presence of the Holy Spirit was vouchsafed; though there was not and could not be amongst them anything of that which is called symbolism, which men now so highly vaunt, as if it were all in all to the progress and perfection of the Church.

It should, moreover, be remembered that much of the point and emphasis of the Jewish symbols depended upon there being but *one* of each kind—one temple, one place of sacrifice, one high priest, &c.—throughout; so that, while the temple stood, St. Paul, and those who desired to conciliate the Jews, by worshipping with them, could only do so by going up to Jerusalem. But the characteristic of Christianity is, that it is a witness throughout all the earth; and neither at Jerusalem, nor in any one place, do men worship. God is a Spirit, and is to be worshipped in spirit and in truth; and wheresoever two or three are met together in his name, there he is in the midst of them, and in nearer presence than the pillar of cloud and of fire.

The law is declared by St. Paul to be our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ; and the best part of what is now called symbolism is of such a character, and is rather a sign of declension in the Church, from its high, and spiritual, and en-

lightened primitive standing. The Church is a living body, and living men are its appointed teachers ; but symbols came into the Church during the dark ages, when clergy and people had fallen into deplorable ignorance. The better part of symbolism is an attempt to supply, through visible forms and sculptured imagery, instruction to the people, which they had become too ignorant to read, and too gross to understand by mere discourse—an ignorance, too, in no small degree ascribable to the Romanists, who withheld the Scriptures from the people, and conducted all their services in Latin, and not in the language of the people. The front of Wells Cathedral, which Flaxman has commended in his lectures, is a good example of what we mean. In its enrichments, all the most prominent facts of Scripture history, such as the creation of Adam and Eve, the temptation, &c., in small compartments, form the different subjects—like pictures introduced into the first books given to children. Pictorial instruction was, in like manner, afforded to those who could not read, by the large painted windows of the cathedrals and halls. And not only were scriptural subjects thus introduced, but the lives of the patron saints ; and traditions still more local and questionable sometimes afforded these materials for architectural ornament or popular instruction, and some decorations had reference merely to the builder, like the portcullis and roses in buildings of Henry VII.

But in the subjects introduced for instruction, and especially in symbols borrowed from the Old Testament, especial care must be taken that men are not taught to Judaize, by being thrown back upon a more confined and less perfect dispensation and system than the Christian. We may be led into error by the Jewish symbols, if the imperfect light to which those symbols were adapted be not enlarged, so as to interpret them according to the fuller revelations contained in the New Testament, and peculiar to Christianity. Error may be inculcated, not only by substituting mere symbols in place of Christian realities, as we have stated it already ; but also by keeping sets of such symbols in the same *relative* positions towards each other, when placed *in the Church*, which they held in the *Jewish temple* ; when the whole analogy of Christianity, and the express letter of Scripture, might require that, if they are retained at all in the Church, their relative positions should be altered. The editors of Durandus are not aware of this, for speaking of screens, they say, “ We are contending for a much simpler thing : for no more, indeed, than the concession of a probability that in the earliest Christian churches there was at least this resemblance to the temple—

that there should be in both a holy of holies and an outer court.....If we were now arguing for rood-screens, we should show that any such distinction of parts made a screen of some sort necessary." (lxiv.) This might be excusable in Durandus, as belonging to the Roman Church, but it is not excusable in his Anglican editors; for it proceeds upon the mistake of separating the clergy from the laity—a mistake of the Roman Church, which ought to be regarded as most sectarian, cutting off the larger portion, viz., the laity, from the body; and most pernicious, as leading to that isolation of the clergy which became the source of such corruption in morals and discipline as roused one indignant protest from the outraged humanity of Europe at the Reformation, and which forms a rankling sore, even now, in all those countries where Romanism prevails. From the Jewish congregation females were legally excluded, by the legal sign of the covenant: from the holy place the people were excluded—none but priests and Levites were admissible: from the most holy place priests and all others were excluded—none might enter there save the high priest, and he only on One day in the year. Is not the mere statement of these facts in itself quite enough to show that the screens of separation must not be in the Christian Church? In Christ Jesus there is neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, male nor female, bond nor free. And He, our High Priest—the only One who could enter the holy of holies, supposing it to have place in the Church—He is not entered into the holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself, and is seated at the right hand of God. It is clearly and positively declared in Scripture, that these distinctions are done away with in the Church; it is the chief point on which St. Paul insists in arguing with the Jews, especially in the Epistles to the Galatians and the Hebrews. And the rending of the vail of separation in the temple, at the crucifixion of Christ, is given as the sign that this chiefest symbol, and the highest act of Christian worship, are transferred from earth to heaven; by resurrection and ascension Christ has entered there, and through the rent vail—his flesh—there he ever liveth to make intercession for us—and we, through him, the only Mediator, have continual access to the throne of grace in heaven.

"For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh; and having an high priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a

true heart, in full assurance of faith." (Heb. ix. 24, x. 19). And St. Peter, addressing the whole body of believers, calls them all lively stones, built up as a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ; and says, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light." (1 Peter ii. 9). And it is put beyond dispute that he is thus addressing the whole body of believers, laity as well as clergy, by his proceeding to exhort them severally according to their different ranks and stations—masters and servants, husbands and wives; and especially by his saying, "The *elders* which are *among you* I exhort, who also am an elder.....feed the flock of God which is *among you*.....Likewise, *ye younger*, submit yourselves to the elder: yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility." (v. 1, 5).

The only line of separation which we are warranted in drawing is that which divides the Church from the world. For admission into the Church, baptism is the ordinance, and in baptism the line of separation is past. All then become members of one body; in that body there can be no division without schism, immediate injury to both, and peril of death. The clergy, it is true, are more honourable members, but set in that honourable place for the good of the body, and not for their own sakes; and it is only in proportion as both parties feel this mutual dependence and need of each other, that the station will be kept, and due honour be rendered. Without it there will soon spring up arrogance in the one party and independence in the other.

The Reformers were not a horde of ruthless barbarians, wantonly destroying beautiful objects from want of taste to appreciate or want of knowledge to comprehend them; it was because they well knew the false doctrine inculcated through these outward forms, and the corruptions which were invariably consequent upon the practices which the forms indicated, that they warred against the things. We know these evils not as they did—by experience; we have coldly to think them out, or darkly grope them out in the pages of history. The editors of Durandus occasionally recognize the truth of the oneness of the Church as consisting of all the baptized; for, when speaking of what they conceive a Church ought to be, they say, "We enter.....close by us is the font; for by regeneration we enter the Church." (cxxx.) But they are not consistent—slipping out of the true idea of a *Church*, which is necessarily, *at present*, an abstract thing, during the absence of the Head

and the scattered condition of the members ; and slipping into a *congregation of worshippers*, which, as a present and real thing, is necessarily but a fragment, and that consisting of some who, not being of the body, are not in the Church at the time, having either *never been admitted*, or been *put out* for discipline sake. " In early ages the laity were not all classed *en masse*, as with us now. Among them were three classes—the faithful, the catechumens, who had not yet been admitted to holy baptism, and the penitents, or those who had lapsed. True to itself, Church architecture provided then a separate place for each of these divisions." (lvi.) Yes, we say, but the place provided for the unbaptized was *not within* the Church of which we are now speaking ; and *into* the Church of which we are speaking *all* the baptized were admitted, even such of the laity as were not sufficiently instructed to be admitted to the communion : and their *dismissal* when that holy mystery was about to be celebrated is the usual derivation assigned for the word *missa*, or "mass." And it admits of no question that the early Church regarded baptism as so much of an introductory rite that it was equally valid when not performed in the Church, and even when administered by those who were not priests ; and St. Paul seems to have studiously avoided baptizing when any inferior minister was at hand. " I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Galus : lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name." (1 Cor. i, 14). The lavens in the temple and the tabernacle were in the *outer court*, and not in the holy place ; and many of the primitive baptisms certainly took place, by choice, in running streams, following the practice of John the Baptist ; and it is even said that such was the baptism of Augustine by St. Ambrose, and that on this occasion it was they extemporized the *Te Deum*.

And this leads us to the last error we shall notice, but which pervades the whole of symbolism, namely, the attempt which is made to prefigure, and even anticipate, in our *present* imperfect condition, the Church *as it shall be* when perfected and united to its Head in the kingdom of heaven. For such kind of symbolism this is not the time. The creation, still under the curse brought in by the fall, cannot now afford fit materials ; and that which is attempted to be shown requires living men as its expositors, and cannot be shown in the lifeless forms of creation, however perfect they might be.

It is truly observed, that "the Revelation is nothing but one continued symbolical poem." (xlii.) But what of that ? It symbolizes a *future* condition of the Church—the glorious, the heavenly ; not the *present*—the suffering, the earthly con-

dition: and symbols belonging to the *future* are quite as incongruous with the *present* as are the *past* symbols of the Jewish dispensation under the *New Testament*. Besides, all the symbols of the Apocalypse are *living* creatures—not posts, and boards, and curtains—or gold, and silver, and marble, wrought into the various inanimate forms of the tabernacle and temple. What countenance, therefore, do these *living* symbols give to the introduction of *inanimate* forms into the Christian Church? The Church is a living body, and these living symbols represent the forward progress of that body to its glorious destiny in the kingdom of heaven; which final or triumphant and heavenly condition of the Church is shown by anticipation in the vision of chaps. iv. v., and is also brought into view as the close or consummation of every other vision of the Book of Revelation. But can any one seriously assert that the Church actually is in glory, surrounded by the angelic hosts, and, together with the cherubim and seraphim and the whole creation, ascribing, in one song, glory to God? Or can any one say that the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and that all his enemies are swept into the lake of fire? Then where is the point of saying that this is a symbolic book, if such symbols are out of place in the present condition of the Church, as well as of a class different from those which are sought to be introduced?

Any one looking at the plans of the early Eastern churches, as given in Beveridge's "Apostolical Constitutions," might be disposed to agree with the opinion, which has been very confidently advanced, that they were arranged in conformity with the Apocalyptic visions. But it is far more probable that the Basilica, or hall of justice, in Constantine's palace, furnished the model for such churches, when we find that both the form and the name were adopted in the Basilica of St. Paul at Rome, one of the earliest of known Western churches. During the first three centuries of persecution the worship of the Church had necessarily been conducted privately, in upper rooms, sepulchres, and caverns, or wheresoever they might remain unnoticed and undisturbed. But when Constantine embraced Christianity he allowed them to meet in the Basilica, and it is reported that this was the first building of a public nature set apart for the service of God; and that it was what we should call a nave and two aisles, the bishop's throne being at the upper end, and behind the altar, where the emperor's throne had previously been placed, before the altar was introduced. Churches of this simple form certainly preceded those which were cruciform, and the want of greater space led to the addi-

tion of transepts of the same dimensions as the first building, so as to form the Greek cross ; and a further extension of space led to the lengthening the western limb of the cross, so as to form the Latin cross, which was adopted almost universally throughout Europe after the tenth century. The puerile conceits of Durandus did not long precede his own age ; did not begin until a clergy and people, sunk into almost equal ignorance, busied themselves with mere forms, in place of having faith in the heavenly realities. And in the conceits of Mr. Lewis we imagine that he has the merit of entire originality, for we search in vain for traces of such things in any preceding age.

It should ever be borne in mind that man is the last and highest work of the Creator's hand ; and not in lifeless matter—not in living animals, did the image of God appear, but in a living soul, for whom all other things were created, and into whose hands they were committed. So in the new creation, as the Church is called, it is not through material forms that the mind of God is to be attained by us, or can be made known to others ; it is only by all coming in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. By God having breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, man became at the first a living soul ; and by the Holy Spirit the new creation is wrought in the Church. It is to manifest spiritual realities that God hath ordained a Church ; and for this, as the ultimate purpose and highest end, Christ became incarnate ; since by no created thing which is *only* material, and by no spiritual being which is not *also* material, can spiritual realities be represented. They can only be shown forth by a creature, which, whilst it is spiritual, so exists in connexion with matter that the spiritual can become apprehensible through the material medium ; and such is man. By man alone, of whom the body forms a component part, which yet is under the guidance and control of his spirit—by such a creature alone can spiritual realities be shown forth to the apprehensions of others. And so it was the will of God, for his more perfect manifestation, that the Eternal Son should not for ever remain an incomprehensible spiritual existence alone, but should, as Son of God, become also Son of Man, and as the Christ, the God-man, become the perfect revealer of the Father—"Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.....Then said I, Lo ! I come to do thy will, O God.....He taketh away the first, that he may establish the

second." (Heb. x. 5-9). And to make this an eternal fact, stable as the being of God, Christ, the God-man, rose from the dead, and the body which he assumed is the sacred shrine of that glory which he had with the Father before the world began. Which resurrection in him both assures and necessitates the resurrection of our bodies to be either truly members of the body of Christ, or witnesses to the glory of God. It is a poor view to suppose that what we have at present in the Church is our all; it is equally poor, and groundless to boot, to suppose that disembodied spirits have their all before the resurrection. Christ is not a disembodied spirit, and until the resurrection, until the departed spirits receive again their bodies, they are not like him; they are not, save by spiritual communion, one with him. Therefore it is written, "The dead praise not thee, neither any that go down to silence." It is by living men, only while the man *lives*, the *entire* man, *body* as well as *soul*, either now, or at the resurrection, that God is truly glorified. There is a spiritual communion with Christ even now, by the Holy Spirit; that communion is probably still more close and uninterrupted in the departed saints, whose spirits are doubtless in a state of blissful consciousness, kept so by the same Holy Spirit. "We that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed;" even this vile body is better than none at all; "but we would be clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." It is to this that we look forward as the perfecting of the Church, and the accomplishment of all the glorious promises made to her. In the resurrection we shall attain unto "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels—to the general assembly and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." And how perfected? By attaining unto the resurrection of the dead. (Phil. iii. 2). "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect.....for our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," (ver. 20). "It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." (1 John iii. 2). So that our objections to symbolism, when thus attempted to be introduced, so as to swallow up everything else in the Christian Church, not only arise from its

want of truth, and being merely fanciful, imaginary, and puerile; but from the far graver considerations of the errors which it has introduced, and the vital truths which all such exaggerations must ultimately smother. The progress of error is always insidious; it looks, at first, very like truth, and may long appear compatible and held side by side, with truth; but it at length so steals upon the sense as to blind the reason, or keep it in willing abeyance to the superior attraction of present and sensible objects. The truths of the Gospel are so far above sense, so supernatural, that it is never without effort that they are apprehended; never without watchfulness that they are retained. St. Paul prays for the Ephesians, that their understandings may be enlightened, so as to know the exceeding height of the glory to which the Church is raised, as the body of Christ, in his resurrection. "God, who is rich in mercy.....hath quickened us together with Christ.....and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, in his kindness towards us, through Jesus Christ." But if, instead of believing on this as a future reality, we endeavour to enact it now, and show it out in symbols, and those things which, in the opinion of man, are splendid, and gorgeous, and costly, what result can follow, but that the future reality dwindles into an imagination, on a par with poetry—a mere fancy, like the baseless fabric of a vision—or an indulgence of taste in architecture, sculpture, and painting?

We do appreciate good taste and architectural propriety; we do think that, in this point of view, the first of the volumes before us has many excellent remarks, and we hail with pleasure every attempt to raise ecclesiastical architecture to its true dignity—as the handmaid of religion, ready to minister towards the proper and dignified exercise of all her holy functions. But let not architecture take religion's place—let not lifeless stones take the place of living men: for this can end in nothing better than turning men to stocks and stones—making religion a dry round of empty forms, ending in the last and lowest degradation of the Church, by the substitution of such formalities in place of the redemption, justification, and sanctification, which are only to be attained through faith in Christ Jesus, the living Head of the Church.

The second of the works before us, "*Hierurgia*," by Dr. Rock, is a valuable book at the present time, and should be in the hands of all who wish to understand fully to what extent the Romanists make use of symbols in their services; and

it is especially worthy the consideration of those who may doubt the tendency of that inordinate desire to revive obsolete forms which has sprung up in so many of our clergy. We scarcely need say that Dr. Rock is an unquestionable authority among the Romanists. His book is written in a very good spirit, and with an apparent desire to conciliate; the explanatory notes and references are very full, and it is illustrated by numerous and very well engraved plates, nearly all of them by Moses. We have not thought it necessary to go into a detailed examination of such a work, it being a fair account of existing practices, accompanied by the usual narration of their origin, and significance, and results. And if we have succeeded in our intention of laying down such principles regarding symbols as may counteract the improper use of such things, this will be a better antidote to anything erroneous in this book, or idolatrous in the Papal system, than criticizing the practices *seriatim*, as they are detailed by Dr. Rock.

A Roman Catholic, too, in doing all these things, is at least acting in consistence with his professions; while the English clergy, who edit such books as Durandus, are doing things inconsistent with their professions, and acting and speaking in disparagement of truths for which their fathers laid down their lives, and holding doctrines which the Church, whose orders they bear, even now repudiates, and would, in former and bolder times, have repudiated with tenfold distinctness and energy.

"Aunt Elinor's Lectures" are cleverly got up, with very good wood-cuts; but if, as is most probable, it be not written by a woman, we do not like the trickery of it—and if it be, we nauseate the pedantry of such a woman, and would be sorry to see our young ladies become professors of architecture, in place of attending to their proper and domestic duties; for it would spoil them as entirely as they would spoil architecture, so far as their influence extended; and might, in a measure, spoil our Church, by the insidious and stealthy introduction of things for mere prettiness sake, involving principles or inculcating errors, of which those who introduced them might not be in the least degree aware.

Mr. French's book is very creditable to him, as showing that he understands his business, and has been at considerable trouble to get the best articles, prepared and fashioned in the best manner, for his customers. We introduce it chiefly as a sign that there is "*a great rage*" for these things at the present time, and in order to call upon the clergy to make themselves well acquainted with the principles on which the use of all such

things in the Church should be made to rest; for much more harm has been done by means of things which have been allowed to creep in through want of vigilance, than by wrong practices consciously or intentionally introduced. In these things, as well as in doctrinal matters, it is while men slumber and sleep that the tares are sown among the wheat; and when they are sown it may be impossible to root them up without destroying some portion of the wheat also. God alone must be the object of our worship. Everything that tends to solemnize our thoughts in coming or leads directly to Him in our acts of worship, is good; everything that obscures or turns away from Him—be it the workings of our own mind—be it the ministering priest—be it forms or ceremonies—all, in so far as they do this, are wrong, and easily pass into sin, and sin of the highest kind, viz., IDOLATRY.

ART. II.—*The Waldenses; or, the Fall of Rora.* A Lyrical Sketch; with other Poems. By AUBREY DE VERE. Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1842.

2. *The Search after Proserpine, Recollections of Greece, and other Poems.* By AUBREY DE VERE. Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1843.

WE took the opportunity, in a former number, of noticing some of the most prevalent errors in the modern school of religious poetry. We there endeavoured to show how far it was wise to admit poetry into the precincts of religion, and upon what distinct conditions. We are now recalled to the subject by the first of the two volumes which stand at the head of this article; and we shall again attempt briefly to develope those principles, according to which it seems reasonable to review such poems. The same remarks are hardly applicable to the second of the two volumes, as the title-page indicates a different fount of inspiration than the Oxford Tracts; there is, however, a unity of design in the two volumes that will render the observations which may be made upon one not wholly inapplicable to the other.

We, therefore, purpose to consider the principal poems separately; as our imaginary standard will have then been declared, and the criticism of the different poems will stand or fall with the principles which we shall attempt to enunciate.

This seems the only just and reasonable method of reviewing poetry; it sweeps away at once all those dogmatical flip-

pancies which so infallibly either disgust or mislead the reader ; and it elevates poetical criticism into a higher region than the day-dreams and idiosyncrasies of a reviewer. To apply this method to all poetry would be impossible, as there are many metrical performances which approximate so nearly to utter worthlessness, that no standard could be found sufficiently low. With such, however, we have here nothing to do ; we leave books of such a character to those who have more time, patience, and temper than ourselves.

We turn cheerfully to such productions as those of Mr. De Vere, as, amid much that is crude, single-sided, and defective, there runs a strong clear current of those feelings which inseparably belong to the character of a Christian gentleman. The little scrolls, crosses, capitals, tracery, and tabernacle-work which are prefixed to the greater number of poems in the first volume tell their own tale in their own harmless way. They at once announce the writer to be young, enthusiastic, and full of those thoughts which cling lovingly round the foliating orders of a Gothic niche ; they also prepare us to meet with allusions to topics and sentiments which seem as strange in their present position as the Sun-God among the herdsmen of Thessaly.

Upon this point we will state a few principles, which will be equally applicable to all poems of a religious nature, and perhaps may be useful in forming an estimate of Mr. De Vere's first volume.

To begin, then. If we acquiesce in the modern division of poetry into *subjective* and *objective*, it will not take much difficulty to prove that religious poetry, when exhibiting exclusively the features of either class, will present to the mind a painful and distorted appearance. As we have, in a former number, attempted to point out how far religious poetry may advance in these two great divisions, we purpose, in the present case, to point out the different, yet equally dangerous effects, that inseparably attend on an extreme devotion to either side.

If we consider, first, subjective poetry, we shall readily appreciate the peculiarities this school must necessarily introduce into religious feelings. It is the most seductive, and probably the most dangerous, as it turns the eyes inwardly upon the soul, until, in the intentness of self-contemplation, all external influences are forgotten. Self-examination is, indeed, the first and last duty of every mind. Deep, silent, and solitary contemplations are the best incentives to true religion ; and the power of exercising them is among the greatest gifts bestowed on us by the Author of all good. But these differ widely from

that morbid gaze on our own passions and emotions which has been lately so apparent in the graver writings of the day. It is but little different from the unruffled quietism that a well-known writer has assigned to the influence of opium. Hours might pass away, and the entranced opium-eater was still gazing on the busy fishing-town and the calm sea beyond, in contemplations as aimless as the shadows that were crossing the landscape. There seems to have been a species of mental antagonism that produced passive neutrality, as silence is said to be nowhere more intense than behind the waters of Niagara. Such a state of mind is most deplorable in all the common duties of life: melancholy theories usurp the place of cheerful practice, and, instead of peace and life, bring with them the hopelessness and languor of death. We do not remember any passage in which evils of this peculiar system are more touchingly depicted than the following noble lines from "The Castle of Indolence." The poet is mainly alluding to this aimless introspection, as far as it casts its shadows over human energies, although the sentiments equally apply to the overclouding of those nobler feelings which we are now more exclusively discussing:—

"To noontide shades incontinent he ran,
Where purls the brook with sleep-inviting sound;
Or when Dan Sol to slope his wheels began,
Amid the broom he basked him on the ground,
Where the wild thyme and camomile are found:
There would he linger till the latest ray
Of light sat trembling on the welkin's bound;
Then homeward through the twilight shadows stray,
Sauntering and slow. So had he passed many a day!

"Yet not in thoughtless slumber were they passed;
For oft the heavenly fire, that lay concealed
Beneath the sleeping embers, mounted fast,
And all its native light anew reveal'd:
Oft as he traversed the cærulean field,
And mark'd the clouds that drove before the wind,
Ten thousand glorious systems would he build—
Ten thousand great ideas fill'd his mind;
But with the clouds they fled, and left no trace behind."

If such be the evils attendant on this system, when considered simply with reference to the ends and aims of this present life, what shall be said of it when it may seem to intercept and embarrass us in our pathway to eternity? And it is impossible to doubt that it does stand between us and the light; for when we consider how seductive is that reference of all thoughts

and feelings to the secret judgment-seat of our own minds, without appeal to any higher tribunal—how flattering to pride that power of clothing all external events with the investiture of our own dreamy imaginations—we can no longer doubt that the peculiar punishment of such self-concentration may be what a most miserable man sang of himself—to be pursued, Actæon-like, by a fierce horde of in-born thoughts. In a word, the subjective principles of the present day tend to make us forget that we are members of one common body, and sons of one mother—the Catholic Church of Christ. We find ourselves solitary, self-occupied beings, treading wearily over the wilderness of life, unsupported by the consolation and society of the other members of our great Christian family. The necessity for this union and fellowship has been enforced by the author of the “Rectory of Valehead,” in such simple and expressive language that we cannot forbear from quoting the passage :—

“As the subject maintains connexion with his king through the links of society above-mentioned, so the individual with Christ through the corresponding bonds of the Church. He cannot for a moment consider himself isolated, and independent of the next link above him—his family ; nor that family deem itself unconnected with the next superior bond—the congregation.”—*Rectory of Valehead*, p. 12.

This is enough to dissuade us from unknitting those bonds with which we are so lovingly bound, and dissolving an union which God himself has authorized. It is for these reasons that we declare ourselves so openly against the whole school of subjective poetry upon religious topics. Our impression is, that the effect is, in all cases, to give prominence to individual feeling, and to tinge all things with the pale and sickly hues of private thought. Every one, as we have before said, must deeply search into the inward state of his mind ; but it should be only with a view of correcting the inherent evils and errors, and not of musing languidly upon them, or bringing them, in all their meretricious adornment, to the half-pitying, half-admiring gaze of the world. The current of sound and healthful sorrow does not mingle with the brackish waters of introspective sentimentality. Moreover, such wayward dreamy fancies are doubly destructive, as they do not only bring disease and morbid longings to those minds that unhappily give themselves up to their influence, but most commonly present peculiar allurements to the susceptible minds of others. The young are frequently drawn irresistibly into the magic circle, and find a melancholy pleasure in contemplating the mournful imagery presented to them, when they should be devoting every energy to the acquisition of a knowledge that has the eternal attributes

of cheerfulness and peace. It is on this principle that we object to certain portions of the "Christian Year:" it is, perhaps, difficult to conceive any book, of the same number of poems on strictly religious subjects, with so little to find fault with: it is our constant companion, and deservedly merits all the praises that have been bestowed on it. Still we would not be like the blind Balbinus, who found pleasure in the deformity of his mistress; we would rather honestly bestow both censure and commendation, and not omit notice of what is bad because we keenly appreciate what is good. Thus we unhesitatingly express our disapproval of the following stanza in the "Christian Year:"—

" Well may I guess and feel
 Why autumn should be sad;
 But vernal airs should sorrow heal—
 Spring should be gay and glad:
 Yet as along this violet bank I rove
 The languid sweetness seems to choke my breath:
 I sit me down beside the hazel grove,
 And sigh and half could wish my weariness were death."
Third Sunday after Easter.

We here fully acknowledge the exceeding beauty of these lines, and admit that, in the next stanza, a sort of corrective is applied; but still, at the risk of being considered cold, prosaic, and practical, we condemn in itself the very melancholy pathos that is, perhaps, their greatest charm. Such expressions would be sufficiently appropriate to the lament of an exiled lover, where the appearances of joy and gladness in the external world are in dissonance with the melancholy longings within; in fact, the lover of Geraldine has adopted the same sort of ideas, in a description of Spring, wherein "eche thing renews saue onely the lover"—

" And thus I se among these pleasant things,
 Eche care decayes, and yet my sorow springs."

Under such circumstances they may be suitable enough, but, even if accompanied with a sort of disapproval, they inevitably tend, by their suggestion, to weaken the principles of true Christian sorrow. That should be a sorrow for by-gone sins, till, as Jeremy Taylor says, "the very heart-strings crack," and not the feeble and inarticulate wailings of earthly grief. This spurious melancholy forms so great a feature in some of the inferior religious poetry of the present day, that we strongly advise all who feel themselves enchained by such imagery to

VOL. XVI.—D

read the chapter on Contentedness in the "Holy Living" of the author we have last quoted. His view was widely different, as he recognized in the external features of nature nothing but soothing and consolation:—

"I can walk (says he) in my neighbour's pleasant fields, and see the varieties of natural beauties, and delight in all that in which God delights—that is, in virtue and wisdom, in the whole creation, and in God himself. And he that hath so many causes of joy, and so great, is very much in love with sorrow and peevishness, who loses all these pleasures, and chooses to sit down upon his little handful of thorns."

We have thus briefly considered the dangers of subjective poetry in religion; it tends to exalt the individual into a representative of the species—it weakens those bonds by which a Christian community ought to be held together—it gives a looser rein to private judgment—and, if carried to a dangerous height, must end in pride, self-satisfaction, and dissent.

Let us now consider the errors introduced by the other extreme—strongly objective poetry. In this school the individual is merged into insignificance, the mind being wholly employed in the contemplation of material objects, and in noting down and classifying the impressions at once deducible from them. The hidden pathways of human thought are no longer wearisomely traced out with speculative curiosity, but the wide open book of nature is studied with a diligence that rarely fails to transfuse the freshness and harmony of external appearances into the poetry that would describe them. There is, however, in this species of writing, a tendency to repetition and sameness; the imagery becomes cold, formal, and conventional—or, on the other hand, is elevated into bombast, and rings with sonorous emptiness. Again, undue importance is assigned to the form and outward investiture, while the subtle workings of the spirit, that give to that form vigour and animation, are unnoticed and neglected. In reading such poetry we feel that we lack something; we admire and wonder, but cannot love; we are not satisfied with the graceful images presented to us; we would know what feelings they excite in others, or what emotions they summoned forth in the breast of him who presents them to us. Hence, in classical writers, those passages have been always most keenly remembered which bear the impress of human feeling. The sorrows of Orpheus are the bright spot of the *Georgics*; the speech of Priam to Achilles is, perhaps, remembered better than anything in the whole twenty-four books of the "*Iliad*;" and, to descend more to particular phrases, we find those most frequently

quoted which involve expressions and adumbrations of mental actions. For instance, it is almost painful to think how often the *αγριθμον γελασμα* of Æschylus has appeared in every possible form; we heartily wish our old war-worn friend were to be, by common consent, presented with the wooden foil and discharged. It, however, serves to illustrate our meaning, and prepare us for the deficiencies we may expect in such a style. Let us now consider such poetry with reference to religion, and we see at one glance the state of mind it must inevitably lead to. It must divert the mind from the inward meaning to the outward symbol—from the altar to the gift thereon—from mercy to sacrifice. All the external rites become doubly impressive; pomp, pageantry, and processions usurp the places of unostentatious worship and simple prayer. This natural theory will incidentally explain many of the strangest aberrations of the human mind on religious subjects; among these, the most singular are those instances in which Polytheism, with its Oreads, and Naiads, and leaping satyrs, has, for a brief space, swept backwards like a flood over the imagination. We are in no apprehension that the worship of Jupiter Olympius will be restored, or that mossy altars will be erected under the greenwood; but we merely allude to the mental phenomenon, as admitting an easy solution upon the principles we are demonstrating. This singular regression is said, now and then, to make its appearance in Germany; and we can readily conceive that, in troubled times, when the unquiet minds of men are grappling with shadows, or wandering miserably up and down the starless night of infidelity, they should for a short time cling to the external forms of Paganism. We are, however, concerned with the explanation, rather than the development of such aberrations, and this we conceive to be an excessive bias towards objective imagery, heightened by a wild and unrestrained imagination. It is hardly possible to conceive that such a man as Schiller gave himself up to such follies; yet his well-known ballad, *Die Götter Griechenlands*, written during a turbulent period of continental history, when the minds of men were tossed about by the waves of civil strife, would certainly lead us to think that he felt something of what he wrote. With this we have nothing to do; our object will be to verify our theory, by quoting two stanzas, which seem to prove that a passionate search for palpable objects of belief, for the splendour and gorgeous myths of the old world, are the key-notes to this singular illusion. We annex, side by side, Mr. Merivale's spirited and literal translation—

<p>“Schöne Welt, wo bist du? Kehre wieder Holdes Blüthenalter der Natur! Ach, nur in dem Feenland der Lieber Lebt noch deine fabelhafte spur. Ausgestorben trauert das Gefilde Keine Gottheit zeigt sich meinem Blick; Ach von <i>jenem leben warmen Bilde</i> Blieb der Schatten nur zurück.</p>	<p>“Whither art thou gone, fair world? Ere long Yet return, sweet age of nature’s bloom! Only in the fairy-land of song May your bright illusions yet find room. Winter’s gloom our silent fields en- wreathing— To our eyes no Godhead’s form, display’d: Ah! of yon bright picture, rapture- breathing, Nought is left us but a shade.</p>
<p>“Alle jene Blüthen sind gefallen Von des Nordens schauerlichem Wehn; Einem zu bereichern unter allen Musste diese Götterwelt vergehn. Traurig such ‘ich an dem Sternen- bogen, Dich, Selene, find ‘ich dort nicht mehr Durch die Wälder ruf ‘ich, durch die Wogen Ach, sie widerhallen leer!”</p>	<p>“All those blossoms—late so fair —have perished, Scattered by the north’s ungentle blast; While One Great Supreme is only cherish’d, And the pageant host of heaven overpast. Sadly now I scan the starry cave— There no more art thou, Selene, found! Through the woods I call, and through the wave— They give back an empty sound.”</p>

Another fascinating, but most dangerous error springs from this sort of religious poetry. We allude to romanticism in sacred subjects. External objects and external acts occupy the mind so exclusively, as to tend to expel the inward feeling and the thing signified by the outward rite. And our remarks will not be inapplicable to the present times; for it is impossible not to have noticed, in the last ten years, a growing love for the pageantry and picturesqueness of religion. The revived taste for ecclesiastical architecture has, in some cases, been called into a spurious vitality, by having infused into it the spirit of the times. If nothing else urged us to speak, it would be the danger this glorious science may run of being elevated above the cool regions of simple reality, into transcendental conceits. Romance is the root of the evil; and in proportion as it is alluring and seductive, must it be resolutely avoided. If the siren sing, we must, like the companions of Ulysses of old, have our ears closed with wax, and row stoutly and swiftly through the dangerous calm. It was wisely re-

marked to us, that the same awe and reverence ought to be felt in crossing the threshold of a simple country church, as in pacing into the long, lofty aisles of a cathedral. Perhaps it may be impossible to entirely obtain such a mastery over all human feeling: especially as the admiration of greatness (as Hooker has remarked) is inseparable from our nature, and may be said to arise from a pure source, as it is, in fact, an acknowledgment of the infinite substance of God.* We must, however, watch with the utmost vigilance these vague and undefined longings, and reject whatever seems calculated to promote them, or to draw the eyes from the Shechinah to the pomegranates and flower-work of the temple. Having thus stated our opinions, such as they are, upon religious poetry, we proceed to refer them to Mr. De Vere's first volume.

Our fancied division meets with a fortunate illustration in two poems, which seem designed to shadow forth the very positions we have been maintaining. The first is entitled a "Tale of the Modern Time," and delineates the psychological history of a thoughtful, self-centred man of the present day. The poet meets with an aged man, all of whose actions are tempered with a strong inward feeling:—

"Gentle he was, and kind (the neighbours said),
Albeit an idle life and vain he led:
Odours he loved from flowers at twilight dim,
And breath and song of morn: children loved him."

He tells his own story. A buoyant youth, full of high energies and keen thoughts, grows into a proud and lonely man, deeply versed in all science and in all the wisdom which is of this world. He bows at no shrine, save that of the mind, and at length—

"A long disguise
Fell from me in a moment; and I trod
A worshipper no longer, but a god!"

At length he finds out the dark precipice, towards the brink of which his earthly pride was leading him: he sees, in a moment of time, his long-hid sins, the ghastliness and deformity of his inward spirit, and so falls thunder-smitten:—

"Thus on my throne, that marble mountain height,
My soul I saw! I went I knew not whither;
Down like a tempest fell from heaven the night:
I heard the sea, and rushed in panic thither!
By ghost-like clouds, and woods my step made wither,
And rock, and chasm that seemed to gape and sever,
I rushed, and thought I rushed for ever and for ever."

* Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity, book v. chap. 69, § 1.

After this sudden revulsion, he spends his time in solitude or in aimless wandering, until at length the time of sorrow is over-past, and the presence of the Redeemer of mankind disperses the clouds of dejection and penal despair:—

“From that time saw I what ’tis heaven to see—
That God is God indeed, and good to man,
Who once hath proved Love’s great reality,
Henceforth *forgets himself to probe and scan*.
Knowledge for him renits her ancient ban :
Back fly these demons, outwardly to sin
That lure the soul, or turn our inquest ead within!”

This poem is probably the most remarkable in the volume; there is considerable vigour of expression—clear, bold imagery, and nothing transcendental or unintelligible. One thing we can hardly help remarking—its extreme similarity to Mr. Tennyson’s “Palace of Art.” It maybe purely accidental, but undoubtedly the structure of the tale is the same, and there are individual passages that echo one another in a very singular manner; thus, in Tennyson, we read—

“Singing and *murmuring in her feastful mirth*,
Joying to feel herself alive,
Lord over Nature, Lord of the visible earth,
Lord of the senses five.”

Tennyson, Palace of Art.

We then find in Mr. De Vere—

“All thoughts I pondered, *murmuring in my mirth*
That text, be thou, O man, the Lord of earth.”

Part ii. Stanza 2.

Again, Tennyson, speaking of the downfall of the soul, after her haughty reign in the palace of art, thus describes her despairing condition:—

“Deep dread and loathing of her solitude
Fell on her, from which mood was born
Scorn of herself; again, from out that mood,
Laughter at her self-scorn.”

We find this same period described by Mr. De Vere in a similar way. In both, the soul is plagued with phantoms, retires to sullen solitude, and again returns to peace through the influences of religion. We merely notice these coincidences, without any intention of charging Mr. De Vere with plagiarism: for, in the first place, they may be accidental; and in the second place, if the thoughts be derived from Mr. Tennyson, we respect Mr. De Vere for his good taste, and are bound to declare that he has used them in a manner perfectly accordant with the tenor of his poem.

We now turn to Mr. De Vere's "Infant Bridal," which is a fair specimen of objective poetry, and stands in strong contrast with the "Tale of Modern Time." This professes to be a tale of the olden time, and is thus pleasantly constructed. Two nations were long torn by wars with one another; the sire bequeathed his sword to his son, and the mortal enmity was kept up from generation to generation. At last the two monarchs of the rival nations fight single-handed and fall. Each one has left behind him an infant—the one a boy, the other a girl. A sudden thought seizes the two nations; they unite in marriage the two infants, and thus finally procure the blessings of uninterrupted peace. The infant pair grow up under the fostering influence of the Church—together they are instructed in the duties of religion—together they learn the solemnities of the marriage state. This description of their childhood is singularly happy:—

"Ah! lovely sight! behold them—creatures twain
Hand in hand wandering through some verdant alley,
Or sunny lawn of their serene domain,
Their wind-caught laughter echoing musically;
Or skimming in pursuit of bird-cast shadows
With feet immaculate the enamelled meadows.

"Tiptoe now stand they by some towering lily,
And fain would peer into its snowy cave;
Now the boy, bending o'er some current chilly,
The feebler backward draws him from the wave;
But he persists, and gains for her at last
Some bright flower from the dull weeds hurrying past.

"Oft if some aged priest the cloister crossed,
Both hands they caught; and bade him explicate
(That nought of good through idleness might be lost)
At large all duties of the nuptial state.
And oft each other kissed with infant glee,
As though this were some great solemnity.

"In some old missal sometime would they look,
Touching with awe the illuminated page;
And scarce for tears the spectacle might brook
Of babes destroyed by Herod's murderous rage.
Here sank a martyr in ensanguined rest:
With more familiar smile these beamed the Virgin blest."

And so their days roll onward, until the youth, at twelve years old, dedicates himself to the cross, and, after many a foughten field, returns to his playmate and his wife, who has in his absence expanded into all the dazzling beauties of tender womanhood.

“No more remains of all this grand old story,
 They loved with love eternal—spent their days
 In peace, in good to man, in genuine glory;
 No spoils unjust they sought, or unjust praise.
 Their children loved them and their people blessed—
 God grant us all such lives—in heaven for aye such rest!”

We turn sorrowfully away from these fine, well-constructed poems, as there is nothing else in the volume to compensate us for our loss. We will rapidly notice the principal remaining poems. The first is entitled “The Fall of Rora,” and is founded on that threadbare subject, the persecution of the Waldenses. These unfortunate people suffered most grievous wrongs from the Church of Rome, and were smitten with the sword and anathematized by councils upon every opportunity. They had, however, a considerable knack of revenging themselves in very summary methods. At the period Mr. De Vere takes up, matters stand thus: Charles Emmanuel II. confirms an edict of Amadeus I.; remits many of the penalties; and, in other ways, ameliorates the condition of the Vaudois, particularly those in the valley of Pinerolo. All goes on well, till a noisy pastor, Jean Leger, excites his brethren so far that they make a tumult, and burn a convent down. For this they are visited by Charles Emmanuel, beaten, and again allowed to be at peace. Meanwhile they are detected in departing from their agreements, and are bidden to sell their property and leave the country, or turn Romanists. They refuse, and after some temporary success, are finally cut down by Pianezza, or driven far into the French valleys. These sufferings are detailed by Jean Leger (whom Mr. De Vere quotes) in a very exaggerated manner; they, doubtless, underwent many barbarities, and lately-discovered documents satisfactorily prove the same; but still we must not break into stormy pity without remembering that they, on the other hand, had by no means fallen short of their conquerors in the perpetration of many sanguinary acts. With this thread of history in our memory, we will open Mr. De Vere: he is as philanthropic and philo-Waldensic as Jean Leger himself.

The third scene, between a cardinal and the Waldensian chieftain, Arnold, is decidedly the best. The influence of wiliness and subtlety on a naturally honourable disposition is well depicted in the character and speeches of the cardinal. Arnold is rather common-place and turbulent: we should have respected him much more if he had not been so noisy. The two most amusing characters in the drama are two children; they are alternately engaged in very foolish or very deep

conversations; for instance, speaking of their grandfather, in the fourth scene, they indulge in the following humble speculations :—

“ FIRST CHILD.

How pretty is that tale he tells us !—think you
He made it all himself ?

SECOND CHILD.

Nay, nay ; 'tis true.

FIRST CHILD.

How true ?—from first to last ?

SECOND CHILD.

No doubt it is.

FIRST CHILD.

Think you the old man had a grandfather ?

SECOND CHILD.

He had ; all men that live had grandfathers.”

And so on. In a few hours, however, a startling change is effected, and our little friends show a great taste for æsthetics. The first child crowns Arnold's daughter ; the second child makes the following remark on it :—

“ SECOND CHILD.

See, you have marred the oval of her forehead,
Whose *curvature is as the shadowy margin*
Of a long laurel leaf ; not broad, like yours !
Lift up the garland higher ; you have stirred her hair.

FIRST CHILD.

But I can blow it back again.”

The remarks on these children may be made applicable to the whole drama—isolated passages are fine, but there is no connected system, no development of character ; all the finer hues are blended into the cold neutral grey of individual indistinctness. The seventh scene of the second act is eminently summary : Agnes is burnt at once, and that without any assignable reason. It was evident that, like her namesake, whom St. Ambrose eulogized, and whom Prudentius sung of, she must be made a martyr, but still the author need not be in such a hurry. The description of the death of the grandfather of the children is very good. He is found dead with his eyes toward the uprising sun :—

“ 'Twas his custom

To sit each morning 'neath his porch expectant ;
And there, in devout quiet, watch the coming
Of light, late ambushed in the drooping clouds ;

Whose colours—crimson, green, and deep-dyed orange—
 Composed, so said he, in their changeful play,
 A sort of music, or prelusive anthem
 Of virtue, to stir up within man's heart
 A harmony as sweet and as devotional,
 Unto their Maker's praise," &c.

We may briefly sum up the whole, and compare the poem to a mass of bright spots of colour which need a skilful arrangement to concentrate them into an uniform pencil of clear light. Among the miscellaneous poems we can hardly forbear from smiling at the lines "To a Boy in the Christ Church Choir." We ourselves know perfectly well the appearance, character, and outward gestures of singing boys, and should not feel any disposition to apostrophize the little hero in his dirty surplice, or

"Thy bosom, while the song is breathed,
 Beneath that snow-white surplice shaken,
 Like lilies when light zephyrs waken."

It takes considerable efforts of the imagination to elevate a little pugilistic, noisy, mud-loving boy, into an angelic messenger. "The Planets" claim some notice: the lines are very easy and harmonious, and at once evince considerable art in the structure of blank verse. The planet Venus is thus happily personified:—

"Next I saw
 A lovely virgin standing, in white robes
 That shone like silver, on the morning star.
 She, with one hand, unto her bosom pressed
 A dove: the other, more than lily white,
 Was ever smoothing down its snowy wings;
 And yet on it she gazed not, but on heaven."

Passing onward in the volume, we admire some parts of the poem, "Adam refusing the Presents of the Evil Race." When one of Cain's descendants bears a shield graven with emblems of battle, and gives an account of civil slaughter—

"All pale the patriarch sat—long time his eye
 Fixed on the deepening crimson of the sky,
 Where sanguine clouds contended with the dun:
 Then turned, and whispered in the ear of one,
 Who, on his death-bed, whispered to his son,
 And the same saw the Deluge!"

There is very little to notice in the hymns: the one for the building of a cottage is tolerable, and might even merit praise, if it did not call into mind that wonderful continental poem which it faintly attempts to imitate. It is not prudent for a

young poet to suggest such comparisons. "The Nun," again, we cannot help mentally comparing with Mr. Tennyson's "St. Agnes." In each poem mention is made of a flower emblematic of the innocence and purity of the wearer, yet how differently! We cannot forbear from putting the stanzas in juxtaposition, to show how elaborate comparison fades away before simple life-like imagery. Let us begin with Mr. De Vere's first stanza:—

"Close by my cheek there lies a lily
Each morning while my lids uncloze,
As lustrous as the morning planet,
And scented like the rose.

"Above my bed a wild dove carols,
Rolling low laughter from her wings,
'Mid waves of light! that velleled music
I hear, and think an angel sings."

In Mr. Tennyson's "St. Agnes" the external face of things is attuned to the clear star-bright purity within. The pale moon is shining upon the snow, and one calm contemplative eye is watching the dark shadows stealing momentarily onwards. The true character of the nun is caught at a single glance:—

"The shadows of the convent-towers
Slant down the snowy sward,
Still creeping with the creeping hours
That lead me to my Lord.
Make thou my spirit pure and clear
As are the frosty skies,
Or this first snowdrop of the year
That in my bosom lies."

Tennyson, vol. ii., p. 171.

These two last lines are of the very highest order of poetry. But the lustrous and scented lily and the carollings of the wild dove are in themselves common-places and sensuous: the lily is not admired for its clear pure calix, or the dove for its innocence, but only as they please the senses, the eye, the nostril, and the ear.

The volume concludes with sonnets. As a writer said of his own epigrams, "*sunt quædam bona, sunt mediocria, sunt mala plura*." Among the best are the tenth, entitled "A Churchyard," "The Alexandrian Version of the Scriptures," that "On Reading the Mores Catholici," "The Worship of the Blessed Virgin," and "The Reply of the Anchorite to the British Bishops." A sonnet is a very difficult sort of poem, and generally very unmanageable in the hands of the young, whose minds are teeming with all sorts of vague impressions

and soaring conceits, which may be made bearable elsewhere, but are positively ludicrous in a sonnet.

The second volume of Mr. De Vere's poems contains three parts: the first is a masque, entitled "The Search of Proserpine;" the second, "Recollections of Greece;" the third, miscellaneous poems. We shall begin with the third part: we have here about twenty odes, forty-four songs, and positively fifty-two sonnets. We are informed that they belong to an early period in Mr. De Vere's poetic history, and, as the effusions of an early age, are very creditable. But taking the whole one hundred and twenty outpourings together, we have nothing whatever to say in their favour collectively. They are all tiresome resemblances of one another—all pretty, all imaginative, all with some little point. In fact, they painfully bring back to our memory our old satirical friend's lines—

" Nil bene cum facias, facis attamen omnia belle
Vis dicam quid sis ?"—

We leave the last line to be finished by more ill-natured persons than ourselves; for we respect both Mr. De Vere and his poetry in the main: but still this golden mediocrity is terribly trying to a poor reviewer like ourselves, who makes it a point of conscience to read every line in the volume. We are not, however, positively bad-tempered, and so we will fairly mention some that appear to us to outstrip their fellows. "The Foundation of Rome" is written in a vigorous style, but it is rather the prodigal vigour of youth, than the calm power of maturer years. We select four or five lines from any part:—

" The shade of Remus round and round shall pace
Night after night your blood-cemented walls,
Till toppling o'er its crumbled base,
To earth the whole vast fabric falls!"

And so on, amid a storm of what the Germans called thunder-words. Just the same sort of fault may be found with the other odes; for instance, in the "Ode to the Planet Venus" we meet with the following sesquipedalian lines:—

" The tyrant seest thou, drowning in mad laughter
A nation's groans, as with a stormy wind;
But lethal shades 'mid royal wreaths entwined,
And the black vengeance pacing swiftly after!"

Such lines as these are the exclusive, unalienable property of poets of a sterner mood, and the corresponding society school, and should not be sought after by so gentle a poet as Mr. De Vere. The best song, perhaps, is that entitled a "Scene in a

Mad-house." It falls exceedingly short of Justinus Kerner's celebrated song from a scene in the same place, but still it is respectable, and the burden calls pleasantly back the quaint conceits of the old ballads:—

" Whence caught you, sweet mourner, the swell of that song?
 ' From the arch of yon wind-laden billow.'
 Whence learned you, sweet lady, your sadness?—' From wrong.'
 Your meekness, who taught you?—' The willow.' "

Amid the fifty-two sonnets "The Old Age of Milton" stands pre-eminent—*Verbum non amplius addam*.

The second part, or "The Recollections of Greece," is much better. The untamed descriptions of scenery are brought under some sort of subjection: images no longer stand alone in their solitude, but become connected together, and fill the mind with more distinct apprehensions of the realities they would shadow forth. The three Idylls are written in an easy, playful style, and are improved by the few graver thoughts with which the poems are tempered. We like the following lines towards the close of the second Idyll. The poet is enumerating the gifts he will offer to his mistress, and the pleasure she will have in floating over the waters in the boat he is to construct for her. We must, of course, remember, that the speech is meant to be that of a Pagan:—

" Are these but trivial joys? Ah me! fresh leaves
 Gladden the forests; but no second life
 Invests our branches—feathers new make bright
 The birds; but when our affluent locks desert us,
 No spring restores them. Dried-up streams once more
 The laughing nymphs replenish: but man's life,
 By fate drawn down and smothered in the sands,
 Never looks up. Alas! my sweet Ionè,
 Alcæus also loved; but in his arms
 Rests now no more the maid of all that love.
 The indignant hand, attesting gods and men,
 Achilles lifts no more: to dust is turned
 His harp that glittered through the wild sea spray
 Though the black wave falls yet on Ilion's shore.
 All things must die—the songs themselves—except
 The devout hymn of grateful love; or hers,
 The wild swan's chanting her death melody." (pp. 72, 73).

The lines written under Delphi have a great deal more pretence, but are infinitely inferior to these same Idylls: the simple fact being this—that the lines under Delphi aim at a sort of metaphysical investigation of the idolatry of the old world, and, of course, end in words printed in capital letters

and confusion. Few young men can deal with such subjects : this connection of the subjective and objective world belongs to such poets as Wordsworth, and not to Mr. De Vere. Mr. De Vere is pleasing and graceful, when he lies among his favourite violet-beds, fanned by the warm Favonius, and lulled by tinkling waters ; but when he casts off his garland and singing robes, and, like old Priam, girds himself with his powerless sword of abstract reasoning, he becomes tiresome, unreadable, and is smitten down by every Neoptolemus. He rises at once in simple vivid description, such as in the fine sonnet entitled "Sunrise," which we earnestly recommend to our readers, and regret that our limits prevent its insertion.

Lastly, we will notice "The Rape of Proserpine." Mr. De Vere quotes the meaning Bacon assigned to the fable—the disappearance of flowers at the end of the year, when the vital juices are, as it were, drawn down to the centre of the earth, and held there in bondage. Mr. De Vere then goes on to say, "that the fable has its moral application ; also, being connected with that great mystery of joy and grief, of life and death, which pressed so heavily on the mind of Pagan Greece, and imparts to the whole of her mythology a profound interest, spiritual as well as philosophical." The affections of humanity are to be represented by Ceres, and the appetites by the Sylvan deities. Such is the outline of the masque. We cannot, however, say that it is in any way adequately filled up ; individual passages are fine, and the whole poem is sprinkled with a rose-water classificality, but that is all. We cannot trace anything like a commentary on the moral application to which Mr. De Vere points. It is a poem that all would read over with pleasure the first time, but would never face again ; it is too full of easy, graceful strophes, and anti-strophes, and sunny descriptions, to shadow forth any deep allegorical meaning. Let any one read the *Klage der Ceres*, and he will at once sensibly feel what may be made of such a subject in a master-hand ; the last stanza but one, which embodies Bacon's theory, is as fine a stanza as Schiller ever wrote.

We now take our leave of Mr. De Vere with mingled feelings : we regret that some pleasant hours over his poems have at last come to an end ; and, on the other hand, we do feel hearty satisfaction that our self-imposed task of wading through his poems should be concluded. If he would consent to write a quarter as much, and spend more time in close and coherent thought, he might boldly claim the continued admiration, both of those who are, and of those who are to come.

ART. III.—*Anglo-Catholicism : a Short Treatise on the Theory of the English Church ; with Remarks on its Peculiarities ; the Objections of Romanists and Dissenters ; its Practical Defects ; its Present Position ; its Future Prospects ; and the Duties of its Members.* By WILLIAM GRESLEY, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield. London: Burns. 1844.

HAVING obtained eminent success in that path which he has marked out as peculiarly his own—the union, namely, of delightful fiction with admirable moral and religious instruction—Mr. Gresley has now entered on a new department of literature, and has come forward in the character of a professedly theological writer. We rejoice at it. He possesses all those qualities which are most essential in this arduous and important task—a strong and forcible style, neither too diffuse nor too brief, but which keeps exactly between the two extremes ; a remarkable clearness of expression, which always allows his meaning to be perceived by his readers ; an earnest and energetic tone of thought, becoming eloquent when the subject demands it ; all these requisites Mr. Gresley possesses in no stinted measure—a circumstance which is rendered evident, not only in the present work, but in all his other productions as well, wherever theological subjects are introduced. The book before us appears most seasonably, and exactly at the time when it is wanted—a popular work, explanatory of those great and important points of doctrine and discipline which have been made the subject of discussion for some time past, and which would endeavour, at the same time, to show the opinion entertained upon each of them by the Church of England ; or, in other words, which would endeavour to display what Mr. Gresley terms “the Theory of the English Church.” Such a work is earnestly called for by the circumstances of the times, and in meeting that call, fearlessly and zealously, we think our author has earned a debt of gratitude at the hands of all members of our holy and apostolic Church. The work which he has produced is so moderate in its compass, and plain and simple in its arguments and meaning, as to be accessible to all classes of readers, whilst at the same time it possesses sufficient learning to render it very useful as a manual of reference to the theological student. We rejoice to think that in the present stir and heat of controversial discussion, when men’s minds are so strangely agitated, and when so many, it is much to be feared, are unable or unwilling, through ignorance or weakness and irresolution, to decide as to which path they shall follow, standards of opinion are being formed, to which

individuals so situated may look with some degree of confidence, certain of not being led astray from those good old paths, those pleasant and peaceful ways, in which so many of the learned, and wise, and good, and pious, walked in ages past; in which the learned Hooker, the saintly Andrewes, the eloquent Jeremy Taylor, have rejoiced; and the zeal of Ken, the sound sense of Patrick, and the admirable clearness and genuine moderation of Robert Nelson, been conspicuous—to instance a few only of those names which have distinguished the theology of the Church of England.

We need scarcely say that we reckon the Anglo-Catholicism of Mr. Gresley among those standards to which we have made allusion, as forming books of reference to which those members of our Church may have recourses, who, at the same time that they consider themselves members of the Catholic Church of Christ, are not willing to forget that they are also members of that most pure and apostolic branch of Christ's Church planted, by the providence of God, in this land—in a word, they, being members of the universal Church, are also in a more peculiar and intimate sense members of the Church of England.

This, indeed, is a distinction which Mr. Gresley never loses sight of throughout his work, in conformity with the practice of the best and soundest divines of our Church. It is perfectly compatible indeed—whatever may be the conduct of some persons on this point—with the most strict and earnest belief in the apostolical succession, and the divine origin of episcopacy, the dignity of the sacerdotal order, and the divine and saving grace and spiritual efficacy inherent in the Christian sacraments, to expose and hold up to reprobation the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, and to point out those tenets in which she has adulterated the true faith. It is quite possible, moreover, to allude, in the respectful and submissive tone of faithful, devoted, and obedient children, to those deviations in practice, if any such there be—though it may be strongly doubted whether any such are to be found—which may exist in our own Church, without holding up as a standard of comparison, or as a model for imitation, another Church, which our very obligations as professing members of the Church of England, to say nothing of that knowledge of her true character which history and experience will enable us to acquire, should oblige us to regard as having departed from the truth and purity of the Christian faith. It is quite possible, moreover, to praise and admire the excellences of our own Church; to be contented with, and grateful for, our happy lot, in

being placed within her peaceful fold ; to return thanks to the Most High for having permitted us to receive the mark of the cross of his blessed Son upon our foreheads, within her most holy and apostolic sanctuary, without indulging in vain, and weak, and presumptuous, and even wicked repinings and longings after another communion, to whose real nature and character we must shut our eyes and close our ears, in an obstinate and wilful blindness and deafness to the sights and sounds of truth, if we expect to gain credit for sincerity in our professions. Mr. Gresley, in his preface, thus states the object of his work—

“ In the present position of the Church, it seemed to me desirable to set down, in a clear and succinct manner, what are the views entertained by those who believe themselves to be consistent advocates of the principles and practices of the Church of England, and to bring together, in their relative bearing to each other, those topics on which, especially, it is necessary for Churchmen, of all classes in society, to be informed.”

In the first chapter he thus explains the meaning of the title which he has given to his work :—

“ The subject intended to be discussed in the following pages, and designated, for the sake of brevity, by the term ‘ Anglo-Catholicism,’ is the system of belief and practice adopted in the Anglican branch of the Church universal, or, in other words, *the religion of the Church of England*. It may, perhaps, be thought by some, that it is incorrect to speak of the religion of the Church of England as anything peculiar or distinct ; it is the religion of the Bible, or the same as that of the primitive Church, or of the Church universal. The first point, therefore, will be to explain in what sense Anglo-Catholicism is to be considered as a distinct object of contemplation, differing from the terms *Christianity* or *Catholicity*.”

Mr. Gresley's explanation of this part of his subject is very clear, and full of good sense. The message of salvation which the apostles preached to all nations was the same everywhere. All nations were invited to believe, and to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; and it was declared to all, that “ he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” And the apostles everywhere promulgated the same discipline and regulations : “ as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem.” The same form of worship, the same creeds, the same sacraments, the same government, under bishops, priests, and deacons, were everywhere established ; and, eventually, the same holy Scriptures, as from time to time they were

VOL. XVI.—E

written, were everywhere received. The Churches which the apostles established were universally the same, or rather, they were uniform and living branches of one Church Catholic, or universal. Still, as in the hearts of individuals the Christian faith, received in purity, may have a different bias and development, according to the character and circumstances of the recipient—as, for instance, the faith of St. John was developed in love—that of St. Peter in zeal—that of Mary in devotion—that of Martha in activity; and as we perceive, amongst those whom we esteem to be good men, a very different form of character and mode of conduct; so it is in different Churches—the form of their faith has been greatly modified by their local circumstances and national characteristics. This variation would be the more marked in Churches which had declined in any degree from their apostolical purity. Thus, while the faith of the Thessalonians grew exceedingly, and their charity towards each other abounded, so as to rejoice the heart of St. Paul, we find in the Church of Corinth a tendency to schism and self-will, such as might have been expected in a rich and intellectual community; and in the Galatian Church, a disposition to rest on the obsolete ordinances of the Jewish ritual. St. John also, in his description of the Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamos, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea, intimates that a distinctive variety of Character had already been developed amongst them. If then, so soon after their establishment by the apostles, and even while they were yet under the apostolic superintendence, we find great diversities of character in various Churches, it is reasonable to suppose that still greater differences would arise in the lapse of centuries. First, as regards rights and ceremonies. Our Article declares that—

“It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies should be in all places one and utterly alike, for at all times they have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men’s manners; so that nothing be ordained against God’s word. Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man’s authority, so ‘that all things may be done unto edifying.’”

Here we have an element of great diversity. It is manifest that the same ceremonial may not be suitable to a hot and cold climate, to a rich and poor country, to a highly civilized and a rude community.

“Therefore (observes Mr. Gresley), while those ordinances which are laid down in Scripture as essential—as the two sacraments; and those which are of so universal and of so early a foundation as to

warrant the strong belief that they were instituted by the apostles themselves—as, for instance, the observance of the Lord's-day, infant baptism, and episcopal ordination ;—while these have been retained in all branches of the Church Catholic, there are many minor ceremonies which appear, in different places, under various aspects ; and the whole form of worship may be very dissimilar in different Churches, and, nevertheless, each Church may be free from error."

Thus great differences may exist, but it is also very possible to imagine that particular Churches may have erred in the additions or suppressions which they have made, and yet may not have so far erred as to forfeit the character of Churches, since they still retain the essential marks. One Church may have erred in one way, and one in another ; and yet if these Churches retain the essentials, and convey grace to their members, they will continue to be the true Churches of the countries in which God has placed them ; and it shall not be possible for any to withdraw themselves from them without incurring the guilt of schism. As a parent claims the reverence and submission of his children, even though deficient in some of his parental duties, so may a Church claim the adherence of her sons, though her practice might, in some respects, be amended.

Mr. Gresley observes, in the conclusion of the first chapter—

"In the following pages I propose to confine my view to the Church of which the providence of God has made us members. My object shall be to show, first, that the Church of England has the essentials of a Christian Church, both as regards its legitimate descent from the apostles, and also its retention of all essential marks, whether of doctrine or discipline ; and therefore that it claims our obedience, as being undoubtedly the true Church in this land. Secondly, to point out the peculiarities of the English Church, and to show how it differs from other Churches ; whether those differences are the natural and unavoidable result of her circumstances, and proper to be maintained ; or whether they are such as may be advantageously remodelled and reduced more into conformity with the original type of the Church primitive and apostolic ; or, lastly, whether they are corrupt departures from her own true and acknowledged principles."

In the second chapter our author treats of the *identity of the English Church*, from the beginning down to the present time. This subject, which is one of great importance, is treated in a most able and convincing manner.

There is undoubted historical evidence, as Mr. Gresley observes, of the existence of a pure branch of the Church universal, governed by bishops, and possessing all the marks of a true Church from the earliest times. If not founded by one of the apostles—which it is generally believed to have been—still no doubt was ever entertained that the bishops of the

ancient British Church derived its orders from apostles in a regular manner. At the time of the Saxon invasion the British Church was much oppressed; but when the Saxons themselves had been converted by the mission of St. Augustine, the two Churches, that is to say, the ancient British and the Saxon, gradually became united; and whether the succession of our clergy is traced through St. Augustine, who received his orders from the Roman Church, or through the ancient British line, the fact of their being duly ordained and descended from the apostles, and so from our Lord himself, is undeniable. And so the Church of England has continued down to the present age. There was no period of time when the continuity of the Church, or the line of bishops, ceased. Bishop has succeeded bishop, in lineal succession, from the first founder down to the present bishops and archbishops. The English bishops, as a body, concurred in the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and remained bishops after the Reformation, as they had been before; and though they were forcibly expelled in the time of Queen Mary, yet, by the decree of Divine Providence, a sufficient number of the old bishops survived, till the accession of Elizabeth, to continue the succession. This preservation of the apostolical succession we may well believe to have been by the special intervention of Divine Providence; as we believe that through the same means the Bible, the sacraments, and the Christian faith have been maintained, and will be maintained to the end of time. The same thing happened at the time of the Commonwealth, when the Church was again partially overthrown. The surviving bishops and clergy were, at the restoration, reinstated, together with the king, and so the identity of the Church was continued. The Church, therefore, at present existing, is identical, by lineal continuity, with that which was founded in this island at the beginning of the Christian era. Each bishop can trace his pedigree from the apostles. By these bishops the inferior clergy have been continually ordained. The ancient sees founded by St. Augustine, St. Chad, St. Swithin, and other saints and martyrs, have, for the most part, remained the same. The boundaries of our ecclesiastical parishes are in general those which existed in the time of our Saxon forefathers. The inhabitants, from father to son, through times of peace and war, of ignorance or learning, of darkness or light, have still been admitted by baptism into the visible Church which God has set in the land, and have received the holy communion one with another, and professed their faith in the same Father, Saviour, and Sanctifier, and still worship in the same general form of liturgy, and

frequently in the same words which were used in times immemorial. Thus the Church of England has been continuous and identical. The very edifices in which we worship God (if not, in many instances, portions of the original structure) occupy in general the site which they have done for ages, and a multitude of them bear, in their construction and architecture, evident traces of having witnessed the revolutions of successive ages. It is often possible to trace in the same parish church the architecture of the Norman invaders, the Plantagenets, the Tudors, and the Stuarts ; while the sepulchral monuments scattered in our churchyards, or preserved in the sacred edifices, show that on that consecrated spot repose the mortal remains of many a long line of nobles or franklins, or those of low degree, who, generation after generation, have constituted the living members of the Anglo-Catholic Church. There may have been many corruptions and declensions, and many reformations, more or less complete ; still the Church has continued from the beginning—

“ One and the same through all advancing time.”

Mr. Gresley, in his next chapter, proceeds to prove that the Church of England maintains the essentials of the Christian faith, and is in a condition to afford the means of grace and salvation to her members. The Church of England gives the Bible in unrestricted use to her members : she acknowledges those holy Scriptures which have been received in the Church from the beginning, and these are freely opened by her to the people, in opposition to the Church of Rome, which not only withholds the Scriptures from the people, except under certain circumstances, but holds the Apocrypha as inspired, which the Church of England, in common with the primitive Church, does not consider in that light. The Church of England retains the creeds, which have always been received in the Church from the beginning, as the authorized summary of the Christian faith. The value of the creeds is very great—they are, indeed, of inestimable value ; for while the Bible contains all necessary truths, the creeds so methodize, and set forth, and illustrate the principal articles of faith as to preserve the Church in essential unity of doctrine. We have in the creeds an invaluable treasure provided for us, as our safeguard against heresy and false doctrine, in essential points, and never to be laid aside without the greatest danger, or rather, a virtual departure from the doctrine of the Church of Christ ! On the subject of the doctrine of the Church of England, Mr. Gresley cites a passage from the writings of Bishop Jeremy Taylor,

which is so excellent that we do not hesitate to extract it at length:—

“For its doctrine, it is certain it professes the belief of all that is written in the Old and New Testament—all that which is in the three creeds, the Apostolical, the Nicene, and that of Athanasius, and whatsoever was decreed in the four general councils, or in any other truly such; and whatsoever was condemned in these our Church hath legally declared to be heresy. And, upon these accounts, above four whole ages of the Church went to heaven; they baptized all their catechumens into the faith; their hopes of heaven were upon this and a good life; their saints and martyrs lived and died in this alone; they denied communion to none that professed their faith. ‘This is the Catholic faith,’ so saith the Creed of Athanasius; and unless a company of men have power to alter the faith of God, whosoever live and die in the faith are entirely Catholic and Christian. So that the Church of England hath the same faith, without dispute, that the Church had for four or five hundred years, and therefore there could be nothing wanting here to saving faith, if we live according to our belief.”

The Church of England also has retained the sacraments which were instituted by our blessed Lord when upon earth, and delivered by the apostles to all the Churches. These are essential. Without baptism no member can be admitted into the Christian Church, nor can any continue in it without partaking of the holy communion of the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Speaking generally, we have retained the mode and the very words in which the sacrament of baptism was instituted, and also, in essentials, the ancient form of administering the Lord's Supper. With regard to the sacraments, the Church of England is advantageously contrasted with the Protestant sectarians, and with the Romanists as well. Our sacraments are administered by those persons of whose authority to administer them there is no doubt. Our Lord commanded his apostles to baptize all nations, and the same body were authorized to bless or consecrate the elements; and from them the same commission has been handed down to the ministers of the Church of England. But those Protestant communities which have lost the apostolical commission labour under the fearful doubt as to the validity of their sacraments—a doubt which, when the vital importance, the absolute necessity of the sacraments in the Christian scheme is considered, may well cause the most serious misgivings, the most awful apprehensions, to those who cannot be sure of their validity. A similar difficulty exists with regard to the administration of the Lord's Supper by the Romish Church, in which the people generally are denied the privilege of participating in the communion of the blood of Christ.

With respect, also, to the other *ordinances*, and particularly the public services, the Church of England retains the general form and outline of the liturgy which was used in the ancient Church, having rejected many things of modern introduction.

The next chapter is devoted to a consideration of some peculiarities of the English Church. One of the chief among these is its insular position; hence the British Church adopted a different method of calculating Easter from the rest of the Western Churches. When the Pope, also, enjoined the use of images in churches, the English bishops were among those who acquired an honourable name by protesting against and rejecting the sinful innovation. The English nation, also, never completely submitted to the usurped authority of the Pope, and were continually refusing to acknowledge his claim.

It is indeed in great measure owing to this isolated situation of our country that she enjoys one of her greatest blessings, namely, that the Church of England stands forth alone as the only Church whose abuses have been reformed, and in which the apostolic fellowship has been preserved. Among other peculiarities which have been produced in our Church by the Reformation is a marked antipathy to Rome, and to anything savouring, in the remotest degree, of Popery. This antipathy is natural. Rome usurped an unjust authority over us—led us, or rather forced us, into resistance, not only refusing all timely reformation, but thwarting it to the extent of her power, and was the first to establish a schismatical communion amongst us. This antipathy has been productive of mixed results. We have, in consequence of it, a most wholesome prejudice against anything approaching to image-worship; anything of imposture we will not tolerate—we are quite free from superstition:—

“But, to set off against these positive advantages (as Mr. Gresley observes, we fear with too much truth), the same antipathy to Rome has greatly contributed to impair our reverence and piety. In our aversion to what we call ‘mummery,’ we have divested our service of much of its decency and order. In our dislike of ecclesiastical tyranny we have imbibed a schismatical spirit of disobedience to all authority whatever. In our jealousy for the authority of holy Scripture we have come to idolize our own private interpretations of it. We cling to our worst abuses as excellencies, if they appear to contrast with the practice of Rome, and refuse to admit the slightest deviation from our ordinary customs which can be supposed in any way connected with that communion. A procession of children, chanting a psalm from the school-house to the church porch, would be reckoned a most dangerous innovation. To deck a church on Christmas-day is orthodox, but on Easter Sunday it would be Popish.”

We strongly recommend these observations to the consideration of those persons—and they are very numerous in the present day—who, from an absurd and affected horror of what they in their ignorance imagine to be connected with Popery, but which is, in reality, totally removed from anything of the kind, run into the opposite extreme, and are frequently induced to adopt opinions savouring of a leaven quite as dangerous—that, namely, of latitudinarianism and dissent.

Mr. Gresley next proceeds to consider the connection which subsists between the Church and the State, or, as it is termed, “the alliance of Church and State.” He appears to be fully sensible of the many difficulties which surround this important subject; and whilst, on the one hand, he is fully alive to the serious evils which result to the Church from the interference of the State, he is candid enough to allow that this principle of State interference is not confined to England, but prevails in other countries as well. He seems to be rather doubtful as to the expediency of reviving the sittings of Convocation with their former full power of debate upon every question, whether of discipline or doctrine, but considers that it should have a decided voice in ecclesiastical matters. To cite his own words:—

“Surely some plan might be devised whereby the concurrence of Convocation, in matters brought forward by the State, might be obtained, or its non-concurrence signified, without entering into all the disputed points of controversy which distract the age. The policy of suppressing a bishopric might be sanctioned or rejected by Convocation without provoking a discussion on justification by faith. There is, amongst others, this serious evil in the absolute silencing of Convocation—that it may be doubted whether an Act of Parliament, with regard to so grave an alteration as the suppression of a bishopric, has the force of law without the concurrence of the Church. Certainly, it is entirely an act of might, and not of right—an instance of practical Erastianism, which cannot be denied. The same may be said of the law of *præmunire*. It has in theory a very Erastian appearance, that our bishops should be virtually appointed by the Minister of the day, especially when we consider the influence by which Ministers acquire, or may acquire, their position. Yet, under the existing circumstances of the Church, it might be doubted whether a better choice would be made, if bishoprics were really elective. To set off against this interference, we have, it cannot be said, the protection of our property; for the Church has been, on many occasions, pillaged by the State itself. However, certainly the State, generally speaking, prevents others from pillaging us.”

We fear, indeed, that in the connection which has subsisted between the Church and the State, the advantages have been altogether on the side of the latter. The Church has at every

time been the best foundation for the State ; and on occasions of trial and danger she has proved the only sure and steady support. When the enemy is at the gates—when disobedience and rebellion are stalking through the land, the State is prompt and eager in calling upon the Church for her certain and valuable aid. But when the peril is over—when peace and quietness again resume their sway, does the State remember the benefits which it has reaped from its alliance with the Church ? We fear not. Experience will tell a different tale. If measures are brought forward which are likely to promote the welfare of the Church, are they listened to with readiness and zeal ? Are they countenanced and favoured, or is an impatient and unwilling attention bestowed upon their advocates, and are they nipped in the bud by a cold and indifferent support ? The promises of supporting the Church, which are offered with so much promptitude when the electoral suffrage is solicited, are apt—sometimes, doubtless, very conveniently for those who have given them—to slip from the memory. The State, in short, *may* and *does* forget the Church, but the Church *does* not, and *must* not, forget the State.

Our author treats of the subject of Church unity at some length, and, in doing so, considers and refutes the different objections which have been made against the system of the Church of England by the Dissenters and by the Romanists. Having shown that the authority claimed for the Papal power is equally devoid of proof, both from Scripture and from tradition also, he proceeds to consider what have been the results of the exercise of this power, and from these raises another very strong and distinct argument against it. This is so admirably stated that we must extract a small portion of it :

“Consider only (he observes) the practical working of the Papal power. We see a bishop in whose appointment all sorts of intrigues are employed ; sometimes a man of notoriously scandalous life—in many cases, ambitious, worldly, and mixed up with the secular politics of Europe ; a temporal prince, too weak to maintain an independent kingdom, and obliged to lean on such support as he can best obtain by policy. Can we conceive a man so situated to be the centre of divine truth—the infallible guide of Christendom ? Let us endeavour to picture to ourselves the manner in which, in any particular case, the Pope would make up his judgment. For instance, in the case of the divorce of Henry VIII. from Catherine of Aragon.”

Mr. Gresley sketches this picture with great felicity.

“Considering, therefore (he says, in conclusion), the *a priori* improbability of a single individual being made the arbiter of the faith of Christendom ; the entire want of evidence, *either in Scripture or in*

early Church history, of any such appointment; and looking to the manner in which the Pope's power has been exercised, and its utter failure to produce that unity for the sake of which it is supposed to have been instituted, it may, I think, safely be concluded, that the Poppedom is not the centre of unity in the Christian Church. Nay, so far from it, the very powers claimed and exercised by the Pope have been, in no small degree, the cause of schism. It was owing, in a great measure, to the arrogance of the Pope that the division took place between the Eastern and Western Churches. The same cause gave birth to the estrangement between portions of the Western Church at the time of the Reformation. His avarice and extortion, his sanction of superstitions and abuses, disgusted the various nations which had long submitted to him, while his supposed infallibility prevented him from agreeing to the necessary reformation. It was time to enquire into the truth of his claim to infallibility; and when no such power could be proved to exist, it became the duty of those bishops, who had been made aware of the need of reformation, to betake themselves to the amendment of abuses, and appeal to the word of God and the practice of the primitive ages."

Mr. Gresley's reasoning against the modern Dissenting system is equally strong and forcible, as might be expected, but the defects and faults of this system are so glaring, and its contradiction and hostility to Scripture and the voice of antiquity are so open and manifest, that we shall not make any extract from his arguments on this subject. Having shown the Papal system of Church unity and the modern Dissenting, or, as the author happily terms it, the "various denominational" system, to be both quite untenable, he proceeds to enquire into the system of the apostles and the early Christians.

In the primitive ages a perfect unity existed, and it was on this principle, as declared by St. Paul, the Church, or household of faith, stood, "*built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building, fitly framed together, grew into an holy temple unto the Lord, in whom we also are builded together, for an habitation of God, through the Spirit.*" This is the true system of the Christian Church. Christ is the head of his body, which is the Church, and is the true centre of unity, which is maintained through the instrumentality of the apostles, and those by them sent forth to proclaim the Gospel of salvation, and gather all the nations into the fold. They were commissioned to preach and to baptize: as many as believed were added to the Church by baptism. And, as men believed, new Churches were formed, the same doctrine was everywhere taught, and the same discipline everywhere established. Bishops and pastors were everywhere appointed over

the new branches of the Church, who received their authority from the apostles, and so from Christ, the head; their office being to maintain unity within their respective Churches, and to form the links whereby the different Churches were connected with their common centre of unity. That such was the system of the primitive Church, there is a remarkable testimony of St. Ignatius, the friend and disciple of St. Peter and St. John, in an address to the Ephesians, about seventy years after the death of our Lord:—

“Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, *like as the bishops, appointed even unto the utmost bounds of the earth, are after the mind of Jesus Christ.* Wherefore it will become you to concur in the mind of your bishops, as also ye do. For your famous presbytery, worthy of God, is knit as closely to its bishop as the strings to a harp. Therefore, *by your unanimity and harmonious love,* Jesus Christ is sung, and each of you taketh part in the chorus; that so, being attuned together in one mind, and taking up the song of God, ye may, with one voice, and in perfect unity, sing to the Father by Jesus Christ; to the end that, by this means, he may both have you, and perceive by your works *that ye are indeed the members of his Son.* Wherefore it is profitable for you to live in blameless unity, that so ye may always have fellowship with God. For if I, in this little time, have held such communion with your bishop—I mean not earthly, but spiritual—how much more must I think you blessed who are so joined to him, as the Church is to Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ to the Father; that so all things may agree in the same unity? Let no man deceive himself; if a man be not within the altar, he faileth of the bread of God. For if the prayers of one or two be of such force as we are told, how much more that of the bishop and the whole Church? *He, therefore, that does not come into the same place with it,* is proud, and hath already condemned himself; for it is written, ‘God resisteth the proud.’ *Let us take heed, therefore, that we do not set ourselves against the bishop,* that we may be set under God.”

There was not a Church (as Mr. Gresley observes) without a bishop, receiving divine grace and authority from the apostles and dispensing and transmitting it around and onward. The Christian Churches are as rays from one common centre, or branches from one common stem. Christ is the true vine—we are its branches; Christ is the sun of the system—we its rays. Each Church which continues in “the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship” is a branch from Christ, its stem and head. Thus a visible identity is maintained by the apostolic or episcopal succession, whereby we have fellowship with the apostles, and so with Christ, the head. By the same succession of ministers the Church is continually propagated amongst the heathens, and new branches are formed, just as a tree puts forth fresh

shoots every year. This reception and transmission of the divine grace and authority, through the means of the apostles and their successors, the bishops, is as perfect and real in the remotest district, and will be in the most distant ages, as it was in the days of the apostles. Time and space affect it not. The English Church, being an emanation from Christ and his apostles, and continuing in the 'apostles' doctrine and fellowship,' is, so to speak, as close to Christ as it was when our forefathers were first gathered into his kingdom. And being thus joined to Christ, we are in union also with all Churches of every age and place, which are in union with him.

"Nothing (Mr. Gresley remarks) can justify individuals in deserting the communion of the Church in which God has placed them, but the failure of that Church to maintain its union with Christ, or to afford the means of salvation to the people. And such a failure is not to be laid to the charge of the Church of England. She stands the representative of the Church first planted on these shores by the apostles or their successors. She maintains her continuity with them by lineal descent. She has reformed her doctrine on the model of Scripture and the primitive ages; therefore, in all respects, she is as truly the divinely-appointed dispenser of the means of grace to the people of this land as if all her bishops had received their commission from the hands of St. Paul himself. On this ground she claims the allegiance of all the people whom God has placed within the limits of her jurisdiction; and denies the right of any within her dioceses to set up rival altars, or independent places of worship, under pain of the guilt of schism. On the same grounds of her apostolicity and orthodoxy, she claims union with all Churches, of whatever age or country, who still remain in the 'apostles' doctrine and fellowship.' This she believes to be the true unity of the Church—unity within herself, union with every other apostolic Church, and union with Christ, the Head and Bishop of all the Churches."

The chapter which treats of the English Reformation is admirably written, and is drawn up with great judgment, candour, and impartiality, and displays one of the most striking features of the author's mind—a quality, moreover, which is of peculiar value in the present day—we mean discretion.

A considerable portion of the volume is devoted by the author to considering certain practical defects which exist amongst Churchmen, and which arise from a neglect of the rules and discipline of the Church. Among other evils to which this neglect has given rise is the sin of schism,* and this, not only that internal schism which has grown up within the pale of the Church itself, but also that external schism, that separation from the Church, and rending asunder those bonds which unite her to her children, which constitutes Dissent,

and which is too often the result of slighting and not attending to the rules and ordinances of the Church. Mr. Gresley cites those canons which are expressly directed against schism, than which nothing can be more stringent ; still (as he observes) it must be confessed, that in practice the Church does not sufficiently discourage schism. She too often suffers her own laws on this subject to fall into abeyance ; and what is still more to be deplored, the acts of some of her individual ministers, it is to be feared, frequently tend to produce this sin. Too many of the clergy are accustomed to hold such language with regard to Dissenters as to give them great countenance and to perplex the minds of Churchmen with regard to the real sinfulness of schism.

“ What can be more perplexing to a plain Churchman (Mr. Gresley asks) than to read the foregoing canons of his Church (those which he has been quoting), and then to see his own parochial pastor, it may be, publicly associating, for religious purposes, with men whom his Church declares *ipso facto* excommunicated ? The too frequent result has been to generate a feeling that Dissent is of no importance whatever, and that each man is perfectly at liberty to attend the schismatical meeting-house without blame or danger. Another way in which the Church, as a body—laity as well as clergy—has given encouragement to schism, is by the sinful neglect to provide places of worship and ministers of religion, for the fast increasing population. The present generation is doing much to repair the injuries which the Church has received in these respects. She is everywhere building churches, and she is beginning to preach a sounder doctrine. Nevertheless, it must be expected that great drawbacks will continue. Dissenters, having been accustomed to regard their separation as a right rather than as a sin, feel aggrieved by our attempts to win them back, instead of answering our advances to reconciliation. Much of this might be expected ; the schisms of the English nation will not be healed in a day ; no, nor in a generation. Let it be our business to use such means as shall be most likely to restore a right feeling amongst them. In changing the tone with which we have been accustomed to speak to Dissenters, as beloved brethren and fellow-workmen, and using such language as shall give them to know that they are in great danger, and in a state of schism, we must speak gently, as to men who have erred in ignorance ; we must take much blame to our own Church for its former negligence ; and as there can be no doubt that there are many honest and conscientious men amongst them, we may hope gradually to win them back to fellowship and intercommunion with the Church of their fathers, from which, it may be, without wilful fault of their own, though to their great disadvantage, they are now estranged.”

On the subject of those internal divisions within the Church herself, which may be termed almost internal schism, Mr. Gresley speaks with great good sense and judgment. He sets

out with asking the following question :—What is, practically speaking, the religious system of the English Church ? What is *Anglo-Catholicism* in practice ? In answer to this question he states that the Church catechism must be taken as the foundation of that practical system which the Church teaches, as the religion of the Bible, the Gospel of salvation. The first doctrine which we find taught in the catechism is the doctrine of original sin. The child is told, that “being by nature born in sin, a child of wrath,” he was, by baptism, made a child of grace. He is instructed in his own natural sinfulness, and the free and unmerited mercy which he has received for the sake of Christ, his Redeemer, in that while he was yet an infant, and subject to God’s wrath, by reason of his sinful nature, he was made, by God’s grace, in baptism, a member of Christ and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. Without any merit or deserving of his own, he was adopted into God’s family, made a member of that body of which Christ is the head, and a sure title was given him to an heavenly inheritance. These are the first great truths which he is taught. Next follow the conditions on which those high privileges will be continued to him, namely, that he shall renounce sin, believe the articles of the Christian faith, and keep God’s holy will and commandments. The articles of the Christian faith which he is bound to believe, and the commandments which he is bound to obey, are then declared to him ; and seeing that he is not able of himself to do the things which have been promised for him, he is taught to seek for special grace by prayer ; and also, when the fitting time arrives, to secure continual strengthening and refreshment, by a faithful participation in the body and blood of Christ. Besides which, a solemn service is provided, according to which he is continually to render worship to God, and so obtain his grace and heavenly benediction, and increase in faith and holiness, as he advances onward in his Christian course. This is the system which the Church delivers to her children as the Gospel scheme of salvation.

“It is notorious, however (Mr. Gresley observes), that there are many, even amongst Churchmen, who make little account of this scheme of salvation. They contend that, whatever may have been the advantage of baptism, in point of fact, no persons keep their baptismal promises, and therefore none maintain their baptismal privileges. All fall more or less into sin, and therefore they contend all need *conversion* in after life, if they are to obtain God’s mercy. Upon this notion a large body in our Church, in common with Dissenting bodies, either altogether deny the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as taught in our

formularies, or in practice set it aside, and address those who have received baptism just as St. Paul addressed the heathen. But surely this cannot be right. It is unreasonable to suppose that a scheme so deliberately set forth by the Church—so carefully insisted on in her formularies, and ordered to be taught to all whom she has admitted to Christian baptism—is a system of religion *for children only*, and one which has no applicability to grown-up persons. It is not to be believed that this early and solemn admission into the Christian covenant must all go for nothing; that the privileges which they have received are valueless, and the conditions to which they are so solemnly pledged sure to be broken. The truth is, that the Church not only *begins* her scheme with baptismal regeneration, but *continues in the same system throughout*. She does not consider her catechism as a mere religion for the young, but as containing the fundamental truths on which their Christian life should be built. The congregation present at the baptism of infants are emphatically called on, 'with one accord, to make their prayers that the child may *lead the rest of his life according to this beginning*.' We are taught to pray that, 'being regenerate, and made God's children by adoption and grace, *we may daily be renewed* by the Holy Spirit;' that God will *strengthen* us by the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, and *daily increase* in us his manifold gifts of grace, *until we come to his everlasting kingdom*."

It is indeed most true that none are perfectly pure from sin in the sight of God. Still we may trust that there are many who do not so sin—so wilfully, presumptuously, and habitually transgress God's law, as to forfeit the privileges of their baptismal covenant. There are some, it may be hoped, who are nurtured by pious parents in the faith and fear of God, and, like the young Samuel or Timothy, serve Him from their youth up. It may well be doubted whether the majority of those eventually saved will not consist of those who have thus grown up in God's service, and never yielded themselves to the positive *dominion* of sin; and whether our best means of completing the number of God's chosen be not by endeavouring to add to the number of those who shall avail themselves of their baptismal privileges, by carefully training them, from their youth up, in godly ways. There may be many also who, though not trained up as children of God from their infancy, yet would not rightly be said to have forfeited their baptismal covenant. There are many who have not had the blessing of pious parents to develope the seeds of grace within them, and, in consequence of early neglect, want that godliness and spiritual-mindedness which is the mark of God's most favoured servants, and yet are not devoid of conscientiousness and right principle—who firmly believe in Christ their Saviour, and desire to do his will; their misfortune being, that they have not been rightly trained and instructed in what the law of God requires. These shall grow up too much in careless worldly

ways, and appear to be little influenced by religion ; and yet, when the promises and privileges of their baptism are presented to their minds, they shall acknowledge the obligation, and begin to serve God more faithfully. Such as these could not be said to have so fallen from their baptismal grace as to need conversion. The seed was sown at their infancy, and did not at once take root ; but when quickened by divine grace, it shot forth, and bore fruit more or less abundantly. Others there may be in whom the toys and sports of infancy, or the innocent pleasures of youth, may have been suffered to occupy so much of their hearts, that their spiritual state could not be called satisfactory or safe ; yet, when they are tempted to yield their members to Satan, the grace of God within them, first given them at their baptism, may have striven and gained the mastery, and saved them from destruction ; and so the very approach of danger may have proved the occasion of safety. Others again may have been overtaken by sin, and in an evil hour yielded to temptation ; and then their conscience, smitten and alarmed by the flagrant evidence of guilt, may at once have thrown them back on God's mercy ; so that they shall not be ranked amongst those who have presumptuously yielded themselves to the dominion of sin, or been guilty of the great offence of trampling under foot the grace of God.

" These cases are mentioned, not with the slightest intention of palliating sin, or denying the great danger of swerving, be it never so little, from the path of duty ; but to show that it is a false assumption to say that all have so sinned after baptism that their baptismal regeneration goes for nothing, and that they need again to be converted. The Church's practical scheme, therefore, is this—*regeneration or new birth at baptism*, and a course of holy living in the faith and fear of God ; and, to those who fall into sin, *the gift of repentance*.

* * * * *

" The whole tenor of the Church service is adapted to the case of those who *have been* admitted into the Church of God, whether they have continued, in the main, to walk as becometh those who have been redeemed of the Lord, or whether they have fallen from their privileges and need repentance. None are addressed as heathen who need for the first time to be converted. The conversion of the heathen is a different affair altogether. The formularies prepared by our Church for the use of her children are all along intended for the use of those who *have been born again of water and of the Spirit*."

Such is the system of the Church. But, on the other hand, the modern system of Dissenters, and that which is adopted by the so-called Evangelical party in the Church, is based on quite a different theory—that, namely, of *conversion*. By persons of this school the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is

not unfrequently flatly denied or passed over: though, if there be one doctrine more plainly taught, or more prominently insisted on by the Church, it is this. They appear never to contemplate the possibility of children being trained up in the faith and fear of God; they take for granted that all have forfeited their privileges as God's children; they apply to baptized Christians all those passages of holy Scripture which speak of unconverted heathens. Thus the simple Gospel scheme, so beautifully embodied in the formularies of our Church, is thrown into inextricable confusion. Regeneration, conversion, and repentance are all confounded together. Baptized persons, penitents, and heathens are all addressed in the same language. Those formularies of our Church, the baptismal service, the catechism, and confirmation, which by the Dissenters are summarily rejected, are by those Evangelical (so-called) Churchmen who sympathize with the Dissenters either tacitly passed over, or explained away in a manner, the impropriety and inconsistency of which can scarcely be concealed, even from those who adopt this course.

It must not be supposed that this is a mere speculative difference about a doctrine. The difference of doctrine gives a distinct colour to the Church system, and that which is opposed to it. The Church system, as represented in our Prayer Book, adapts itself to the case of those who, having been received into the Church of Christ, are to be led on by a course of holy training through their life of trial, encouraged to continual advance, aided when their steps falter, reclaimed when they have wandered. For this purpose a solemn ritual of service is provided, such as is suitable to pledged soldiers of the cross. Each day a portion of the living oracles of God is set forth before them; their faith is quickened by the presentation to their minds of all the circumstances relating to their redemption, as well as the Person of their adored Redeemer, his advent, birth, life, death, and resurrection. The Gospel scheme is thus placed before them, each year, in a round of holy ordinances. Care is taken, likewise, so to arrange the service of the sanctuary, with alternate praise and supplication, that a most solemnizing effect shall be produced on the minds of those who faithfully join therein, and their minds preserved in an equable state of pious devotion; or, if they have fallen into sin, shall be touched with fear and shame, and quickened to a sense of their unworthiness and danger. Above all, the means of grace, and strength, and comfort are, from time to time, provided for them, in the communion of their Saviour's body and blood. Proper times also are appointed for self-denial

and humiliation ; and God's ordained ministers are directed, in their capacity of teachers, to address their congregations on all fit occasions of their assembling together, and instruct them, both by preaching, and catechizing, and visitation, in the doctrines and duties of religion—set before them Christ crucified—explain to them their Christian privileges—encourage, exhort, admonish, reprove ; in short, assist them continually in their progress to the inheritance which was sealed and delivered to them when they were adopted into God's family and made “ members of Christ ” at baptism.

“ The *Evangelical*, or, more properly speaking, the *conventicle system* (says Mr. Gresley), is quite dissimilar in theory and character. Its main object is the sermon. ‘ We are justified by faith ; ’ ‘ Faith cometh by hearing. ’ ‘ How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard ? and how shall they hear without a preacher ? ’ The preaching here spoken of they consider as the same thing as the set sermons which gratify the ears of modern congregations. What St. Paul says, obviously with reference to the mode of conveying Gospel truth to the heathen nations, the ‘ Evangelicals ’ assume as the system applicable to the members of a Christian Church. That we are justified by faith, all of us receive as a most important Christian verity ; but not to be thrust forward to the exclusion of others no less unquestionably revealed. Preaching we all acknowledge to be a most effectual ordinance ; but surely, to those brought up in the bosom of a Christian Church, ‘ faith cometh ’ in a variety of ways, and not solely, or even principally, by hearing sermons. Faith cometh by parental instruction, by catechizing, by reading the word of God or good books, by the example of holy men, by conversation with those who have already found Christ, by the mysterious influence of contact with what is good, by prayer, by self-denial, by the public worship of God, by sacraments. Preaching is but *one* ordinance or means whereby faith cometh to individuals in a Christian land.”

The author devotes a chapter to a consideration of the *irreverence* in regard to religious matters which is observable in the English people. There is a great deal of good sense in much of what he says upon this subject, but we cannot go with him in regard to the extent to which he seems to think that this fault—and it is a very grievous and lamentable one—prevails amongst us. We quite agree with him as to the existence of a very large and deplorable amount of irreverence ; but, at the same time, we feel convinced that there is a great amount of reverence for religion and her ordinances, and one which we hope and trust is fast increasing.

Those chapters in which Mr. Gresley treats of the remedies for those religious defects which he has pointed out, are full of important matter, and strongly demand the serious attention

of every friend of religion. Among other remedies which he mentions are a large increase in the number of our churches and clergy, and a more strict attention to the ordinances of the Church—more particularly, a more zealous observance of her fasts and festivals. We wish we could devote more space to these chapters, which are among the most valuable in the volumes, but we fear we have already exceeded our limits, and shall therefore content ourselves with extracting the following passage on fasting, in which this somewhat difficult subject is treated in a manner at once so plain, so simple, and so very reasonable, as to come home to the feelings of all who read it:

“Consider, first, the ordinance of *fasting*. An ordinance more strictly scriptural—more decidedly sanctioned by the example of our Lord himself and his apostles—more plainly in accordance with the practice of the holiest men, whether of the former or latter dispensation—more necessary for the present age, when thousands are spiritually dead in luxury and self-indulgence; in short, a more valuable and important ordinance cannot be named. * * *

Until this ordinance of religion be restored, it is futile to look for improvement, either in individual holiness or national piety. Men are being destroyed by excess of wealth, and ease, and comfort; amassing riches, acquiring consequence, devoting themselves to the pursuits of ease and refinement, and not a few ruining themselves by positive over eating and drinking; not perhaps so as to be liable to the charge of intemperance, but still so as to clog and sensualize both body and soul. To correct these flagrant evils the Church provides her simple remedy—but the world rejects it. The Church appoints certain days of fasting and abstinence, on which, by self-denial in small things, for religion's sake, we may learn to control our lusts, and passions, and appetites, and make those sacrifices which are required of us. The Church bids men fast for their soul's health—but the world says, ‘No, we would rather sit in our pews and hear the sermon. We do not feel disposed to fast; it is not the fashion of the day. You tell us, “faith cometh by hearing,” and if we have faith, all will be well. Tell us, then, of Christ's sufferings; tell us, while we sit comfortably in our pews, of all that he hath done and endured for us: paint them in your most eloquent language, then we shall believe. What more do you require of us?’”

Alas! is not this the religion of the majority?

“It is very difficult to decide exactly what is the right mode of fasting. To lay down precise rules is almost impossible, on account of the variety of persons, circumstances, and differences of health. To some, absolute fasting might be death; others, who are poor, seldom have more food than is required to sustain the necessary strength for their labour. It will occur to many, that in the present state of society some inconvenience would arise from fasting. Our domestic habits, and still more, our social enjoyments, would be interfered with. ‘How

ridiculous (some will say), when we have an invitation to dinner, to have to look at the Church's calendar, and see whether it is a fast-day—how many pleasant engagements we shall have to decline, and what are we to say when people ask us? We cannot say we stay at home because it is a fast-day—we should be laughed at.' Now I am persuaded that this slight inconvenience itself is one of the advantages of the system. Religion *ought* to regulate our daily lives. We *ought* to make our social engagements bend to our duty. Are there not six days in the week, or at least five, on any of which we may have our dinner parties or other festivities? Let a few persons of rank and influence resolutely set their faces against the desecration of the Church's ordinance, by feasting instead of fasting, and it would soon come to be understood, that when people invited their friends to an entertainment, they ought first to consult the Church calendar, and that to ask a strict Churchman to dinner on a fast-day was as much as to say they did not want to see him. And then consider only the funds which might be devoted to relieving the wants of the poor. If rich people, in London, for instance, would but devote their Friday's dinner, or the cost of it, to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, how soon might the voice of complaining be banished from our streets, and the starving poor be raised up from the dust. *It is scarcely possible to devise a more obviously beneficial plan, whether to relieve the crying wants of the poor, or save the rich from the sensualizing effects of their abundant wealth, than the simple return to the Church's ordinance of fasting.*"

Mr. Gresley then goes on to speak of the festivals of the Church, and of the necessity of observing them as well. The whole of what he says on this subject is equally important. We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting one or two passages:—

"It is not to be supposed, however, that the system of the Church is of so strict and austere a character as to consist of asceticism and self-mortification. It requires, indeed, for the discipline and even safety of its members, the exercise of self-denial; but it also encourages, at times convenient, a holy joy and festivity. *The Church has not only its fasts, but its festivals.* It spreads its hallowing influence over our joys as well as sorrows—it sanctifies our hearts at all times with its holy ordinances. But this branch of our Church system is, like the other, disused and disregarded by the same worldly influence. Men will not admit religion as a guest to their feasts, and so their feasts are ungodly, sensual, and worldly. In truth, we have been so long disused to religious festivals, that we do not know how to keep them. * * The restoration of festivals would be a most efficient method of retaining the attachment of the youth of both sexes to the Church, which is one of our greatest *desiderata*. Too often we lose sight of them when they leave the Sunday-school. Religion is connected, in their eyes, with dulness and restraint; but make it more cheerful—associate it with some degree of interest and chastened excitement—

invite the young men and maidens to return to the school of their childhood, and give their aid in the religious festivity, and you will have put in operation a very efficient instrument for cherishing their feelings of attachment."

We must here conclude our notice of this very interesting and important work, in furnishing materials for which we have not scrupled to make a large use of the volume itself. We hope, however, that our readers will not be contented with the extracts which we have given, but will themselves consult the valuable pages of Mr. Gresley.

ART. IV.—*La Russie en 1839.* Par LE MARQUIS DE CUSTINE.

Bruxelles, Societ  Belge de Librairie. 1844. 4 vols. 12mo.

2. *La Salle d'Armes.* Par ALEXANDRE DUMAS. Paris. 1838.

3. *Le Maitre d'Armes.* Par le Mene Paris. 1838.

WHEN the gallant Sir Walter Raleigh was a prisoner in the Tower, and engaged upon that historical fragment which has descended to posterity under the title of "A History of the World," he one day witnessed from the window of his cell a quarrel and a fight, carried on between two men in the courtyard below. This contention took place in the presence of several spectators, no two of whom were agreed in giving the same account of what had passed before their own eyes. This discrepancy in the evidence of eye-witnesses to a fact so startled the historian, that he determined to give up the vain task of speculating upon events which rested upon no better foundation than a circumstantial testimony; his history was laid aside, for he deemed it a folly to write of the past, of which he knew comparatively nothing, since he dared not trust to his own senses in composing a statement of the simple facts of the present.

We believe that it is an easy matter enough to write truth; but it is not so easy to define what truth is. Actions, like pictures seen in different lights, will wear a varied appearance, according either to the position or the bias of the spectators. This has been universally felt and acknowledged. All writers of narrative have, in their turn, been troubled with this difficulty; but it is, we believe, only the authors of France, whose inventive genius never stumbles at obstructions of a nature like these; they construct a theory, and if the facts do not agree with it, why so much the worse for the facts. Where French writers are not blessed with a boldness of invention, like that of a certain abb , who wrote an account of a siege without

being acquainted with its circumstances, and who, on learning that he had awarded the triumph to the wrong side, coolly replied that it was a pity, but *his* siege was finished—where they do not possess such a creative audacity as this, they make up for it by boundlessness of ignorance. Thus a writer in the *Constitutionnel*, one of the leading journals in Paris, lately stated that Lord Byron's "Ohilde Harold" was an ancient Saxon king! A brother journalist states that Gloucester is a large manufacturing city in Scotland! And another, writing on civil statistics, informs his readers that no native of the three kingdoms can open a shop, sell tarts or vend lucifer matches, without a special authority from the Parliament or the Queen.

We must not be misunderstood as alleging that *all* French writers are equally reckless in stating falsehoods, or equally ignorant as to what are facts and what are vulgar errors; we should ourselves, in doing them this injustice, be guilty of grossly running counter to truth. Their republic of literature can boast of names which few other nations can equal—which no other nation can excel. But it is also an incontrovertible truth, that they have among them men as little regardless of what sort of knowledge they impart to their readers, as was the Louvain student, who gravely told a young class of learners that Michael Angelo was a celebrated physician who had invented rhubarb! We ourselves once met in Picardy with two dramatic pieces (all the literary food that a village inn could afford to a weather-bound traveller), of which one was entitled *L'Idiote*, the other *Les Faussaires*. In the former remarkably dull composition we were, for the first time, made acquainted with the astounding information that Sheridan was the greatest modern poet of England;* the fact being, that that foolish wit knew about as much of Pegasus and the Hippocrean as did Cicero himself, who, after supping his inspiration by spoonsful, contrived to deliver himself of that immortal and solitary verse which says—

"O Fortunatam natam, me consule, Romam!"

But the error of the author of *L'Idiote* is Primrose-hill compared with the Appenine line of blunders of a gentleman who has perpetrated the drama called *Les Faussaires*. This piece really gives us a delectable specimen of the correct idea pos-

* M. de Custine makes an error quite as remarkable, in calling Kotzebue (the writer of sickly prose sentiment) a German poet! The poor victim of the fanatic Sandt could not manufacture verses better than the orator of Arpinum; while his prose is as unlike that of the pupil of Philo, as a Minerva press novel is to the "Spectator."

essed, by the French, of English manners and customs. We see in it a peer connected with a coiner; his lordship resides in a castle, situated in a romantic canton, two miles from London; and to this castle the peasants of the aforesaid canton repair to present flowers to the noble owner's daughter *on her saint's-day*. The more ignoble coiner passes as a farmer, and he dwells in a little hut, on his peculiar patch of ground, situated in a dark glen, adjacent to a gloomy baronial ruin, placed in a solitary part of the sterile mountains, which geographers have *not* marked down, somewhere between London and Richmond! And all the ladies and gentlemen concerned display a strong, but confusing Puseyite tendency; and, having read Mr. Newman's "Lives of the English Saints" by anticipation, they swear by St. James of Canterbury, with a force and an alacrity that, on any day of the year, from the eve of St. Odilo to the third watch on the festival of the blessed St. Sylvester, would have astounded and gratified the venerable Mr. Froude himself.

But these are dramatic writers, and it is their privilege to know nothing, and take liberties with it. But here is Alexander Dumas, a man who has been everywhere, and knows everybody who resides there; who has read everything, and written upon that, and a vast number of other subjects besides; who pens tragedies during a breakfast; and who, if he has not written an encyclopædia, has copied more than one into his works, without acknowledging the sources of his quotation; and who is more read, more laughed at, more praised, more reviled, more admired, more condemned; who writes more beautifully, and much more nonsensically, than any dozen out of the galaxy of his milky-tinged contemporaries. He, like M. de Custine, has written upon foreign countries—has visited Russia, and given, in his "Maitre d'Armes," some extraordinary accounts of what he saw, and what he did not see there; and has also written a series of stories called "La Salle d'Armes," one of which, called *Pauline*, we will analyze for the amusement of our readers, as well as that they may be made acquainted with a modern French romance, in which there is no indecency, as with the writer's peculiar ideas of England and Piccadilly.

Pauline is of course very exciting, very melo-dramatic, and very improbable—*very*. *Pauline* is a young lady, who is married to a Fausto-Juanic-Charles Moor-y-Mephistophilish-Corsairian-Werterlike being, half savage, half soft, and whose name is Horace de Beauzenval. He is a man who kills tigers as well as ladies—slays wild boars and sings bass. In Paris

when the streets have been sufficiently aired for such a man to appear in them, he walks abroad, the very picture of a virtuous gentleman, who has just left the modest group which may for ever be seen attitudinizing in one of the corners of the *Journal des Modes*. But he occasionally retires to an old dilapidated chateau in Normandy, where, in conjunction with two equally virtuous friends, done from the same model, he contrives to play the brigand and murderer, without detection. Pauline, in feminine alarm at the somewhat protracted absence of her husband, and not at all satisfied at living, like Juvenal's Roman lady, *tanquam vicina marito*, proceeds, uninvited, to Normandy, to join him. Here she passes two fearful nights, attended by a sorcerer-like, wild Malay (whose position there is as unaccountable as the much quoted flies who were found in amber), and surrounded by scenes of debauchery and assassination, by which she discovers the true means whereby her husband managed to procure his "small profits and quick returns." The amiable monster, to prevent his wife betraying him, has recourse to the gentle measure of shutting her up in a vault, accompanied by a glass of poison, and a civil *billet doux*. In the meantime he gives out that she has been assassinated, and he buries, in her stead, the body of a young English lady, whom he had shot "positively for this particular occasion only." As this is little more than the commencement of the romance, our readers will make their conclusions ride sympathetically with their wishes, and take for granted that the heroine is not only rescued from her duration in the dominion of Little-Ease, but that she owes her deliverance to the accidental sharp-sightedness of love. Such is precisely the case; the fond captive is restored to liberty by a former admirer; and (as there is no necessity whatever for their doing so) the lady and gentleman set off together, in the character of brother and sister, to England. There would have been no evidences of Monsieur Dumas possessing any sense of what is due to propriety, if he were not so to arrange matters as to cause the death of the husband at the hands of the lover. The author, being a marvellously proper man, has not neglected so forcible an incident, and the accomplished Beauzenval falls by the pistol of Alfred de Nerval, not for his sins to his wife, but for his presumption in aspiring to the hand of Alfred's sister, added to the impertinence of his publishing his position as that of a widower, disregarding the threatenings of the law, and little profiting by the experience of M. de Pourceaugnac, who learnt, when he could hardly better the instruction, that *La bigamie est un cas pendable*.

Pauline, in the meantime, takes to sighing and a liver complaint; becomes very impatient, as does also the reader; and, in an *access* of philosophical drollery, refuses to let her mother know of her existence, for the comical reason, that as the old lady has already regarded her daughter's death with the same view that Lord Aberdeen is said to look upon the conquest of Algiers, namely, as a thing done, *un fait accompli*, and therefore irremediable, by unavailing regret, she deems it not worth while to give her mamma the chance of having to mourn for her twice, sensible as she is that her positive dying is a matter of undoubted and very proximate certainty. This consummation, however, is not achieved till after her arrival in Italy; and when Pauline, considering her vicinity, may be said, with more than usual truth, to have gone to the tomb of the Capulets, the reader is uncommonly tempted to exclaim, with Shakspeare's honest sentinel, "For this relief, much thanks!"

Such is the outline of a popular French romance; and if M. Dumas is enabled to afford his countrymen some little amusement in this production of his versatile genius, we are enabled to do more, by giving English readers the opportunity of laughing at the most superlative absurdity that mortal literary man ever committed. We must, however, first ask them—*Is Piccadilly in foreign parts?* Do you know of such a locality by the Lakes, or near the Wye? Is there a rurality so called among the retirements of Devonshire? Have the pic-nic parties from Knaresborough or Harrowgate ever discovered this new *insula felix* at Plumpton or Harewood? Does it lie on Goldsborough Moor? Is it part and parcel of Brimham Rocks? Does Miss Laurence know of it at Fountains? or the Duke ever find it among the valleys of Bolton? But why do we ask such questions? There is but one Piccadilly, and its habitation and its name are equally divided between the illustrious parishes of St. George, Hanover-square, and St. James, Westminster. The western extremity of its northern side is illustrated by a great warrior, and its eastern extremity by a gentleman, who, though NOT a warrior, exercises a profession by which warriors are made effective; the legislative general is at one end, and the executive gunmaker at the other. Somewhere in the mid space of this sylvan rusticity—where there is nothing of Arcadia, save an equivocal spot near Lord Burlington's, where the Dryads themselves would be puzzled to find either board or lodging—does the clever M. Dumas make his hero and heroine live in a *fancy cottage*, a pretty little structure, *simple, and retired*, with Venetian blinds, and a garden full of flowers! And, behold, there is positively (for the author swears to it) a verdant lawn!

beds of roses !! a well swept gravel walk !!! and a seat under a magnificent plane tree, beneath the shade of which, love, literature, and laziness are enjoyed in blessed unconsciousness of the brick and mortar Tempé, by which they are surrounded!!!! And all this in the matter-of-fact year of 1834. Oh, George Robins, if Piccadilly ever have the honour of being entrusted to your hammer and eloquence, charge the eminent individual who does your fine writing to look upon the locality with the eye of Alexander Dumas, who, on turning out of St. James's-street, saw this *petite maison bien simple et bien isolée*, somewhere about the solitary purlieus of the romantic "White Horse," or in the picturesque and uninhabited wilderness tenanted by the "Black Bear!"

Is it too much presumption to affirm positively that no English author, treating of French localities, ever committed a blunder that can be compared with this, in unmitigated and superlative absurdity? When the celebrated town-councillor of Leeds ingeniously contrived to spell *coffee* without employing a single letter that is to be found in the original word, his *k a w p h y* bore as little resemblance to the aroma-bearing original, as does the Piccadilly of Dumas to the reality which we daily perambulate. He has crowded that already well-possessed locality with suburban villas and highway-side retreats; and in this scene he has placed his lovers, like delighted citizens in a Holloway villa; and the amiable exiles look out, with minds serene, upon the rusticities of the rural district, watched and guarded by the police shepherds of St. George and St. James. Why this would scarcely have been tolerable had the action been laid three or four centuries ago, when, "as yet, black breeches were not;" and yet so deliciously absurd is it, that to alter it, would be like taking the last line from an epigram—it would be like throwing away the sweet part of the orange for the sake of the candied peel; and besides, touching seldom improves anything. We all know what came of Alexander the Great's nose when Augustus Cæsar laid his finger on it.

But, after all, it must in justice be confessed that some of our own travellers, journeying in foreign countries, do occasionally see objects in a very strange light, as well as reason upon matters starting from wrong premises. Mrs. Trollope is one of these. Such of our readers as have visited Prague may recollect that where St. John Neopomuk was flung from the bridge there into the Moldau, the parapet is marked by seven brass stars. The saint suffered this species of martyrdom for refusing to reveal to the Emperor Wenceslaus what the empress (a princess of Bavaria) had imparted to him under the seal of

confession. He is reported to have lain some centuries undiscovered in the sacred stream, and to have been perfectly uncorrupted when taken out. The body, thus found through the miraculous shining, day and night, of seven stars in the firmament exactly over the spot in which it lay in the bed of the river, may still be seen in the cathedral of St. Vitus, reclining in a crystal coffin within a shrine of solid silver, upheld by silver angels, guarded by silver sentinels, and covered by a lofty silken canopy, the corners of which are upheld by solid silver genii. Well, this saint, who so died, and who is thus enshrined, has, by a peculiar process of Roman hagiufacture, become the recognized patron saint of highways and bridges, but especially of the latter :—

Es wurden Brücken aufgeführt
Und Neopomukn drauf posirt.

No one can have travelled through Germany without seeing the venerable figure of a saint, in wood, stone, or humble clay, standing erect on one of its parapets, making the ground holy and the path safe about him. Mrs. Trollope has performed the grand tour and seen these figures; but, too ignorant to know, or too idle to ask their meaning, she gravely informs her readers that the Germans so loved the Jesuits that they have even raised statues in their honour upon the way-sides and bridge parapets; and she really takes the canonized Neopomuk, guardian of travellers by flood and fell, for a counterfeit presentment of a son of Loyola testifying to the gratitude of the people who put him there. Düller's three pennyworth of useful information on "Jesuitien" might have taught better things to the *voyageuse* of Paternoster-row.

Again, some of our readers may recollect, near Baden-Baden, the convent of Lichtenthal, the glory of whose ancient days is departed, but whose beauty has been but slightly ruffled by the hand of inexorable Time. This convent lies in a snug elbow of land, under the shade of an overhanging cliff; it is so embosomed and embowered that it is invisible to the traveller till he is close upon it. How will our readers suppose that a tourist by profession (one who, it would be imagined, was particularly sharp-sighted) describes the position of this lowly, half-hidden convent? Leigh Ritchie, the writer to whom we allude, actually describes it as perched upon the summit of a rock: and he likens it to a Tyrolean castle reared on some wild craig! Surely, when Mr. Ritchie examined this castle, he must have stood upon his head to view it.

But it is time that we should turn to the Marquis de Custine, whose example we have indeed followed by prefacing our

observations on Russia by an introduction not exactly germane to the matter. He has given an introductory prologue to "Travels in Muscovy," by reciting some very startling and admirably-drawn scenes from the French revolution—a revolution which gave his gallant father and grandfather to the scaffold, which inflicted adversity and suffering upon his excellent mother, and which has had its influences, and deep ones too, upon his own disposition and character. We have little hesitation in giving credence to all he imparts to us connected with the above troubled and historical period; but when we arrive with him on a foreign shore, we do not think it so safe to follow implicitly all his impressions of travel. He advances a great deal upon which we should be sorry to depend; but, in spite of his numerous contradictions, we can extract much that is undoubtedly real, important, and instructive. We have been particularly struck with one circumstance in his scattered notices of Russian society—that Russia has no middle class, the division not being merely a vast aristocracy and a vast world of slavery, but, with greater truth, one lord, master of soul and body, and one huge class of slaves of various degree, whose will is not theirs, whose breath is not their own, whose lives, thoughts, and possessions are the property of the brilliant despot who rules, scourges, and smiles upon them.

It is the fashion in Russia to imitate times that are called classical; and it may be imagined that the divisions of society are derived from a heathen but popular model, but this can hardly be the case. Russia, we must confess, has no middle class, and it has often been asserted that there was no middle class among the ancients; but there is a great error in this, as there frequently is in an oft-repeated assertion—society with the latter was divided into the positive slave and his superlative master, and so far the assertion is correct enough; but there was a true middle class, nevertheless, which was to be found among the educated and intellectual portion of the slaves; and if we draw a comparison between that part of ancient society with its corresponding section in modern times, it will be no doubtful matter to determine which may lay claim to the greater degree of eminence. The middle classes of our own days, considering the education which is given them, and the intellect which they may almost purchase, have produced very few men whom posterity will acknowledge; while we, who are the posterity of by-gone ages, recognize the glorious names which made their own and all succeeding times harmonious, although their owners sang while the collar of slavery choked their very utterance. The mediocrity of rank in these individuals found

no corresponding humbleness of ability attending it. Of this rank, or rather of these men of no rank, were Andronicus, the inventor of dramatic poetry; Plautus, the witty but coarse play writer and Jack of all trades—he was the poetized Wycherley of his day; while Terence, who was not only a slave, but a negro slave, became the model of genteel comedy, was the Congreve of his epoch, dined out daily in the Belgrave-square of the Everlasting City, and, like Beaumarchais, unscrupulously stole a good plot, or a good thing, whenever he found either, lying about wanting an owner. Æsop, the fabulist; Phædrus, his imitator; and the moral philosopher Epictetus, who was as low in condition, even in his degree of bondman, as he was exalted in his character of a teacher of mankind, were all slaves; the latter, moreover, was the slave of one who had been himself a slave—a depth of degradation than which there can be none deeper; but Epictetus was an instrument of God, used to prepare men's minds for a change from the vices of Paganism to the virtues of Christianity; his writings being the stepping-stones between the two extremes, admirably calculated to enable the heathen to take a nearer review of the newly-revealed truth, and, having made the one step from infidelity, to induce them rather to make the second in advance to Christ, than to turn again to the dazzling unintelligibilities of the Capitoline Jove.

From slavery, if we direct our attention to mere poverty, the next condition to it, we shall see that the poor men characteristically paid their addresses to poetry: *ut solent pauperes*. Such was Horace, who, if not in want, was of inferior descent, his grandfather having been a slave, and, subsequently to receiving the freedom-giving box on the ear from the prætor, a tax-gatherer. Virgil was of equally mean descent, by his father's side, although he derived some portion of nobility from his mother. Juvenal, too, was not only poor and a poet, a condition to make a slave despise him, but he was a very angry poet into the bargain; and in equal proportion as he was poor, angry, and satirical, in poetry, was Lucian poor, angry, and satirical, in prose; the latter made an indifferent statuary, but he was an excellent contributor to such of the periodicals of his day as required articles of a very high and peppery nature. If the poets were poor, the philosophers were scarcely more celebrated for being troubled with any particular onerous portion of wealth; and thus we see the proudest walks of philosophy illustrated by Demosthenes, the blacksmith; Socrates, the ill-featured offspring of a mason and a midwife; Epicurus, rich only in his boast of having descended

from Ajax ; and Isocrates, whose father manufactured the musical ancestry from which are derived the piano and fiddle families of our philharmonic days. There is a host of remaining philosophers, who, from the obscurity which envelopes them, belonged probably to the same unblessed class ; we can only speak with certainty of the historian Quintus Curtius, who was of an ignoble family ; of the medical writer Celsus, who was most assuredly no Roman citizen, though resident at Rome ; and of Plutarch, whose family, however, was respectable, though history does not inform us whether his father kept a gig.

But though art and science, with the nine sisters who make Parnassus vocal, were thus worshipped by the slave, and his cousin the beggar, wealth was by no means a synonymous term for either sloth or incapacity. The aristocracy of the purse, as well as that of birth, joined with the democracy of mere talent and few *denarii*, in many a pleasant pic-nic to the shades of Helicon and the margin of the Hippocrene. The opulent Lucretius, who believed nothing ; the rich and modest Persius ; the two Plinys—the soul of one of whom, in its letter-writing capacity, entered into Horace Walpole ; the soft and knightly Tibullus, a sort of Latin Sir Philip Sidney ; the profligate Sophocles ; Æschylus, whom, had he lived now, the spread of Temperance Societies would have driven mad ; and, third of the inspired three, their brother dramatist Euripides—all these, *cum multis aliis*, mounted their pegasus with gold spurs ; some, like Martial, got their mouths filled with the sugar-candy of imperial recompense, while others were nearly allied to sovereignty itself, the sires of Cicero having been Sabian kings. The broad-shouldered Plato united, in his own person, the two degrees of which we have been speaking, for, in spite of the great nobility of his family, he experienced all the horrors of slavery ; the liberality of his friends redeemed him from his sufferings at the cost of three thousand drachmæ ; and in this he was more fortunate than his brother slave Diogenes, who, being friendless, was left to hug his irons and teach his master's sons to be virtuous and free.

This is, perhaps, a digression, but it is one, we hope, not devoid of interest. Its connection with Russia is in this much, that the latter country, forming everything upon a classical model, can produce nothing of a classical quality. The slavery of Muscovy will never engender either a Terence or an Æsop. The truth is, that the natural characters of the modern Russ and the ancient Roman are not less unlike than the quality of their climates. The education of the two stand as the anti-

podes of morals. To love truth, and to tell it fearlessly, was part of the religion of the heathen; to appreciate it only for the advantages it may bring, and to conceal it where suppression may bring profit, is the triumph of Russian-Greek orthodoxy; in other words, it is the synonyme of Muscovite policy. Where the higher orders of a nation are void of truth, there can be no hope for the lower—no expectation of their rising above their superiors in morality, in true nobility of soul, but by the means of spiritual teachers, who, knowing the faith, keep it, and teach it in sincerity and truth. Such a blessing has not been granted to the Russians since the day they first knew Christianity. Neither have they possessed it since that period when their Czars first cut off their beards, and fancied civilization accomplished thereby. The reflection made by Durandus upon the clergy of his time may, with sufficient justice, be applied to the *popes* or priests of the Greek Church in Russia—*Aurei et argenti facti sunt calices, ligni vero sacerdotes*:—their cups are of gold and of silver, but the priests are of nothing but wood. Had they been otherwise, we should have found a greater contrast between the lower orders, as delineated by our by-gone travellers, and as described by M. de Custine. Essentially, however, they are much the same. Old Purchass, in his “Pilgrims,” says, that in Russia, “if the woman is not beaten once a week, she will not be good; and therefore they look for it weekly: and the women say, if their husbands did not beat them, they should not love them.” “A Russian bride (says our old school friend Guthrie), on her wedding-day, is crowned with a garland of wormwood: and after the priest has tied the nuptial knot, the clerk or sexton throws a handful of hops on the head of the bride, wishing that she may prove as fruitful as that plant.” When married, “they thought themselves ill-treated if they were not often reminded of their duty, by the discipline of a whip, manufactured by themselves, which they presented to their husbands on the day of their marriage.” In like manner, we meet a corroborative testimony in the “Comment. Sigismundi, Rerum Muscoviticar. 1600; Ratio Contrahendi Matrimonium;” wherein we find the following curious passage:—

“Est Moscoviæ quidam Alemanus, faber ferrarius, cognomeno Jordanus, qui duxerat uxorem Rhutenam; ea cum apud maritum aliquandiu esset, hunc ex occasione quâdam amicæ sic alloquitur: Cur me, conjux charissime, non amas? Respondet maritus, ego vero te vehementer amo: quærebat igitur maritus qualia signa vellet? Cui uxor, nunquam, ait, me verberasti.”

Now we believe that if this degree of affection no longer

exists in the same intensity on the part of the weaker vessel, the slave-lord of the creation in Russia has testified no disposition to resort less frequently to the *argumentum ad baculum*. The love is something less, and an hour's beating will not warm it into life.

But we will confine ourselves, for a brief space, to the Greek Church, as it now exists in Russia. In M. de Custine's pages we find little more on this subject than what is connected with views of sacred edifices, and the religious ceremonies that took place within them. We shall, therefore, probably meet our readers' wishes by shortly stating the general condition of this Church. The head, then, of the Greek community is a directing synod, which has its seat at St. Petersburg. The Russian clergy formerly possessed a chief, in the person of a patriarch, holding great and undefined powers; but Peter the Great abolished the dignity, and transferred to himself that chief ecclesiastical authority in the sacred synod, which had formerly belonged to the patriarch. Henceforward the Emperor became supreme head of the entire Church, no one of whose members dares to hope for the favours of God if he have lost the good-will of his representative, the Czar. This supremacy is now a matter of faith which no one is sacrilegious enough to dispute. Of the synod to which we have alluded he is, by imperial right, the president, and he graciously concedes to his vice-president the exercise of the dignity of metropolitan archbishop. The Greco-Russ clergy are divided into two classes, the regular and the secular. The first, or higher class, are all monks, and never marry; while, on the contrary, no individual dare aspire to the humble, hard-working position of a parish priest, until he be married. The best of them enjoy, if it may be so called, a condition inferior to the degrading one held among ourselves by domestic tutors and chaplains, in the days of Swift and the "Spectator," when persons in orders, holding the above appointments, were occasionally admitted to the tables of their patrons, but were expected to withdraw with the cloth, and, having said *grace*, leave their *superiors* to partake of the *dessert*, the wine and fruit of which they had the privilege of looking at, as they were brought in. A modern traveller in Russia remarks, "that persons of the sacred profession are seldom seen at the tables of the nobility or gentry." During five years that Mr. Coxe passed at St. Petersburg, though almost in constant intercourse with them, he never saw an ecclesiastic at their table. "It must be allowed (he adds), that the parish priests are, for the most part, too low and ignorant to be qualified for admission into

genteel society ; while the dignitaries, being a separate order, and restrained by several strict regulations, reside chiefly in their palaces, within their monasteries." The costume, indeed general appearance, of all classes of the clergy, is pretty nearly the same. They have long beards, wear thin long hair floating over their shoulders, carry a square cap upon their heads, and are enveloped in long flowing robes. But these men partake of the common national character—they are outwardly clean, but inwardly the contrary ; to the public eye, nothing can exceed the splendour, the gorgeousness, the indescribable magnificence attached to themselves and to everything around them. We recollect a passage in Dr. Clarke's "Russia," wherein he describes his astonishment at the grandeur of the Archbishop of Moscow and his attendant priests at one of the great religious festivals—we think the Easter anniversary. He recounts, with admiring wonder, the gems, the jewels, and the miniature paintings which adorned that high dignitary and his satellites ; their embroidered satin robes, and the precious stones which ornamented them ; and the various garments employed in one service of the mass. He compares them to the holy priests of old standing by the tabernacle of the congregation, in fine raiment, the workmanship of "Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah." But the splendour and pomp of the sacerdotal dress, during the exercise of the highest episcopal functions, contrasted strangely with the appearance he made when the English traveller visited him at his own conventional residence near Moscow. He found him—and he could scarcely believe the evidence of his own senses—in a little garden, which he was wont to keep in order ; he was seated upon a turf bank, attended by an aged bishop, one or two other dignitaries, and a few monks. He was attired in a striped silk bed-gown, and his nightcap was still on his head ; woollen stockings covered his legs, and coarse linen socks his feet, the socks being primitively kept to the feet by twisting twine round them ; he had no shoes at all, and a pair of slippers, that might have done duty for them, he had kicked off to a distance : a shepherd's straw hat, with a withered bunch of flowers which he had placed in the band, lay at his side ; and the only remnant of dignity about him was the venerable white beard which nature compelled him to use in private as well as on public occasions. He very naturally told Dr. Clarke that he could not imagine what the English saw in Russia that so many of them visited it ; and then (we mention it as characteristic of the fear which haunts every man in Russian society) he anxiously asked every monk present if he

understood what he had just spoken to the English traveller in French. On being assured that none could comprehend a single word of that language, he became more at his ease, and we remember that Dr. Clarke gives great praise to the science, wit, and freedom which marked his conversation. This dignity was one of thirty-three archbishops who, as bishops, subject to the Emperor, preside over the affairs of the Greek Church in Russia. Their revenues are chiefly derived from the immense estates which Catherine the Second plundered from the monasteries, and out of which she assigned one thousand or twelve hundred a year equally to the bishops and archbishops. The parish priests are exceedingly poor; a wooden hut, a small portion of land, and an annual stipend of from ten to twenty pounds, constitute all that they receive. It may be well asked, on reviewing the general condition of this Church, "who can respect what does not respect itself?" And truly that ecclesiastical establishment can have little self-veneration that sees a military officer, booted, spurred, sashed, and epauletted, presiding at its directing board; whose priests are on a level with lacqueys, and not only get drunk with them at their kitchen stoves, but are not always sober at the altar. A correspondent of the "Portfolio" reproaches them, moreover, with "a Patriarch Emperor giving military decorations to be worn on the robes of priesthood;" but this latter is a circumstance less frequent with the Church in question than with the Romanist communion, at whose expense the remark is too often made. For one Greek priest wearing a military order, we think we could cite ten Romanists. To mention only one, the nearest to us, as much in our memory as by locality—there is the very plump diocesan of Arras. This episcopal dignity of the Popish Church—majestic in appearance, highly-favoured in wealth, as meek in his public performances of all ecclesiastical rites as though he were but a poor bishop of a pure and primitive Church; so outwardly affable in his manner, too, that had he been a king in ancient Greece, the Ephori would have reprimanded him for over civility—belongs to a family which, during many a generation, has been as famous as Spain had been, up to the time of Florus, for the courage of its men and the lustre with which they bore arms—*Viris armisque nobilem Hispaniam*. The race of the Latours (whether *D'Auvergne* or *Maubourg* be added to distinguish its separate branches) have ever, like Dryden's heroes, been "cast in heaven's peculiar mould;" and we need not add that war has been their trade, as it is that of heroes generally. Hugh Latour, the present Bishop of Arras, was, in his youth, a very gay,

frolicsome, daring soldier, who, if ever he entertained thoughts of entering the Church (the usual fate of younger sons, as the convent was the common destination of their sisters), buried them in the bustle, toil, and varied occupations of tented and stricken fields. Pope says that few men attain the praise of their great sires, and he adds, that "most their sires disgrace;" and this was partly the fate of the young Latour. His family had no reason to blush for his achievements in action, but neither could he make them forget the elder heroes of his house. He dealt uncommonly hard blows where that commodity was by no means scarce. He did his duty, like ignobler men, and for once, having stepped with a courageous prudence beyond it, he received the decoration of the legion of honour, the martial cross of which he does not even now disdain to wear upon his well-filled violet waistcoat. He who *was* a wild, half-famished *sous-lieutenant*, is now the politic diocesan of Arras, irascible enough to crush young curates who incur his capricious dislike, and proud enough to refuse to exchange the pastoral care of manufacturing Arras for that of the turbulent and attractive capital of all France. Our readers may take this picture of a Roman Catholic archbishop as a contrast to that of the Greek dignitary, sketched from memory, after Dr. Clarke. If we have paused longer than necessary to draw it, it is because we suspect Hugh Robert John Charles, of the Spanish-Fleming-French diocese, to be M. de Custine's model, *par excellence*, of what a French Catholic dignitary *should* be. But to resume.

"Christianity (says an anonymous English author), as exhibited by the Russians—and there are millions who know it in no other form—becomes an object of horror to the Eastern, even, alas! at times when it is the faith of his childhood. It is evident that the Russian man is not elevated by it; and the religion is hated which is professed by those who seem to know no more obligations as binding on them in their internal, and still less in their international dealing. The very filth of their persons is a matter of loathing in the East—their manners, their morals, their perfidy, their cruelty in success, still more so. The consequence is, that thousands, whose fathers were Christians, are become zealous Mohammedans; and the change, being the result of *outraged humanity and offended moral principle*—of a dread of slavery and of being used for the enslavement of others,—seems, in the meantime, improving to the individual convert; and seeming so, others are struck with the contrast, and so the phenomenon is multiplied. Now this is a fact, and a very frightful one it is, especially to those who have been ready to talk of robbing men of their homes and the soil of their fathers, as so much 'progress of civilization,' and 'nymphs of the cross.' We are justly punished for all such *infernal* ways of doing

the work of heaven. Let us be *just* and ungrasping, and pure and sober—a shield to the weak—not *all that Russia is*—if we are to convert Turks and Circassians.”

The Russian churches, in which this faith of a doubtful complexion is exercised, are the only edifices in the empire which appear to have preserved their primitive originality. Not that the Russians are the inventors of that heavy and capricious style which we have named the “Byzantine;” but, being Greeks, their religion, their disposition, their faith, their education, and their history, justify them in having borrowed from the lower empire, and in preserving what has thus been lent them. All sculptured figures and ornaments are banished from the interior of these religious edifices; and we agree with the author in thinking that they must thereby lose more in pomp and sacred magnificence than they gain in mysticity. But our readers need only visit the Russo-Greek Chapel in London to see that every embellishment is not condemned by the ancient faith. The Greeks are the descendants of the Iconoclasts; but in Russia they have mitigated the severity of their fathers, by admitting gilding, arabesque carvings, and certain paintings, executed after a fashion that requires the most liberal indulgence from those who gaze on them. The only relief that the eye has from the classical monotony of all the public edifices of Russia is to be found in resting upon the churches. They are of a form which modern taste is not allowed to touch, and superstition defends them from being reduced to the mathematical monstrosities which are to be seen around them. Nor is the relief slight in itself; for, if we mistake not, it is Dr. Clarke who states that there are not less than nineteen thousand cathedrals and churches in the cities and towns of this expansive empire.

“The Church of the Holy Trinity (says the author) is beautiful, but bare, like the interior of most of the Greek churches which I have seen here. On the other hand, the exterior of the domes is covered with azure colour, and sprinkled over with the most brilliant golden stars. The cathedral of Kazan, built by Alexander, is vast and superb; but the entrance to it is in one corner—the result of respect for that religious law which exacts that every Greek altar shall be invariably turned towards the east. The street in which this church is placed, not being built in such a manner as to allow of this arrangement being regularly followed, the church has been erected sideways; the architect has been compelled to give way to the prejudices of the faithful, and the consequence is, that one of the finest monuments in Russia has been ruined by superstition. The Smolna church is one of the largest and most magnificent of all in St. Petersburg. It is the property of a society—a sort of chapter of women and

girls—founded by the Empress Anne. These ladies are lodged in enormous ranges of buildings. On going over the enclosure of this noble asylum, this cloister is as spacious as a city in itself, but the architecture would be more appropriate to a military establishment than to a religious congregation. The visitor forgets where he is—it is neither a palace nor a convent; it is a barrack for females. Everything in Russia is subjected to military discipline, and that of the army reigns over the ‘Chapter of the Ladies of Smolna.’”

In Greek churches we find very little preaching, very little controversy; and though in some schools religious instruction is tolerated, it is publicly taught in none. Hence there results a multitude of sects, the existence of which is studiously concealed by the Government. The hold that this religion has on the hearts of its followers appears to be the slightest possible. They are superstitious and bigotted—not religious. Of outward forms they are narrowly observant. M. de Custine expresses some surprise that, even among the upper classes at Moscow, he has seen persons cross themselves on sitting down to dinner, and again on rising. Had he travelled further over the country, he would have found this custom attendant upon all classes, and resorted to upon almost every occasion. A Russian hardly commits any action without this previous ceremony. A hired coachman is occupied full two minutes in crossing himself before he mounts to his seat; he does the same when he descends. A man who passes a church is all agitation, head and hands. He who enters a room crosses himself; he who leaves a room crosses himself. A beggar does not receive your alms till he has crossed himself, and having done this, you have sometimes to hold your eleemosynary contribution while the recipient makes prostration, and touches the earth with his forehead. Mr. Conder, in his “Modern Traveller,” quotes a passage from the work of a recent sojourner in Russia, who witnessed this ceremony in its very greatest perfection, through the breaking down of his sledge. This accident afforded him a very interesting peep into the manners of the peasantry. The woman of the house was preparing a dinner for the members of her family, who were gone to church. It consisted only of a mess of potage. Presently her husband, a boor, came in, attended by his daughters, with some small loaves of white bread, not larger than a pigeon’s egg; these the priest had consecrated, and they placed them with great care before the *bogh*, or representation of God. Then the bowing and crossing commenced, and they began their dinner, all eating out of the same bowl. Dinner ended, they went regularly to bed, as if to pass the night there,

crossing and bowing as before. Having slept about an hour, one of the young women, we are told, according to a custom constantly observed, called her father, and presented him with a pot of *kvass*, an acidulous, pleasant, wholesome beverage, peculiar to the Russians. The man then rose, and a complete fit of crossing and bowing seemed to seize him, with interludes described so inexpressibly characteristic and ludicrous that the stranger found it very difficult to retain his gravity. "The pauses of scratching and grunting, the apostrophes to his wife, to himself, and to his god, were such as Drunken Barnaby might have expressed in Latin, but which cannot be told in English."

We must refer our readers to the original pages of M. de Custine, for a fuller detail of the doctrines, ceremonies, absurdities, and errors of this Church. Our space will not allow us even to condense them. For all the disadvantages of the errors of the Greek Church, and the faults of the Russian Government, he sees a panacea in the adoption of the Roman Catholic religion. No opportunity is lost by him to elevate the latter faith, till he becomes as fatiguing with it as the Russians themselves, with their eternal signs of the cross and bendings of the knee. He even goes so far as to say, that when England consents to lay down her hypocrisy, she will become Romanist!—an assertion which may serve as a specimen of some of the visionary speculations in which he is given to indulge, as well as of their intrinsic value. We turn from them at once, as well as of the consideration of many passages illustrative of the religion of Russia, to narrate the fate of one daring individual, who had attempted to create a change in the minds of the Moscovite Greeks, and to direct them towards the Roman Catholics. In this instance we must allow the author to speak for himself:—

"A few years ago, a man of wit, universally popular in Moscow, noble by birth and character, but, unfortunately for himself, devoured by a love for the truth (a passion dangerous everywhere, but mortal in Russia), took upon himself to print, that the Roman Catholic religion is more favourable to the development of mind and the progress of art than the Byzantine faith of Muscovy."

After entering into a panegyric of the Papist establishment, as warm as it is ill-founded, he thus continues:—

"There is not even a single error in the character even of the Russian women which this writer does not attribute to the Greek religion. He pretends, that if they are light, if they are unable to preserve that authority over a family which it is the duty of a Christian wife and

mother to exercise in her own house, the reason is, that they have never received a truly religious education.

"This book, escaped, I know not by what miracle or subterfuge, from the watchfulness of the censorship, set Russia on fire. St. Petersburg and Moscow the Holy uttered shrieks of rage and alarm; in short, the consciences of the faithful became so fluttered, that from one end of the empire to the other a general cry was raised for the punishment of this imprudent advocate of the mother of Christian Churches..... There was not enough of knout, of Siberia, of galleys, of mines, fortresses, solitudes, in all the Russias, to give confidence to Moscow and her Byzantine orthodoxy against the ambition of Rome, aided by the impious doctrine of a man, traitor alike to God and his country. The decree that was to decide the fate of so great a criminal was looked for with great anxiety. The publication of his sentence experienced some delay, and men began to despair of supreme justice, when the Emperor, in his merciful indifference, declared that there was no cause for punishment, nor criminal to undergo a penalty; but that there *was* a madman who required shutting up—he added, *let the patient be delivered to the care of his physicians.*

"This judgment was put in execution without delay, and in so severe a fashion withal, that the imaginary madman almost justified the derisory decree of the absolute chief of the religion and the State. The martyr of truth was on the point of losing that reason, the possession of which had been denied as existing in him, by a decision from the throne. And only now, *after the lapse of three years*, and at the end of a course of treatment rigorously observed, and as degrading as it was cruel, does the unhappy theologian begin to be allowed the enjoyment of a little liberty. But see the miracle—he himself now doubts of his own reason, and, on the faith of the imperial word, he avows himself mad! Oh, depth of human misery! In Russia, the sovereign mouth, when it reproves a man, is equivalent to the papal excommunication of the middle age.

"The supposed insane victim may now, it is said, enjoy occasional intercourse with a few friends. It was proposed to me, during my stay in Moscow, to visit him in his retreat, but fear restrained me, and indeed pity also, for my curiosity would have appeared to him in the light of an insult. I have not learned what punishment was inflicted on the censors of the book thus published. What I have given is a quite recent example of the manner in which affairs of conscience are, at this day, treated in Russia."

The condition of the people of Israel now sojourning and sighing in their captivity in Russia will require from us but a very few words. That condition, indeed, is so universally known, that we rather turn from a detail of their sufferings, the oppressions under which they suffer, and the privileges of which they have been ruthlessly despoiled, to notice, their general social position, with the particular fact, that Russia herself, unwilling as she is, seems compelled, by some irresis-

tible power, to work for the amelioration of their state of degradation and pain. To the suggestion of an intelligent friend we owe the conviction we have acquired, that great destinies are in the hands not only of God's ancient people, but in those of that Gentile nation of Saxons who welcomed Christianity in its purity, and have spilt their blood to keep it so. At this moment, it is the Saxon alone, and none other, who directs the minds of nations—who gives birth to arts, and increases them—who explores the dark and hidden ways of science, and converts them into cheerful fields, wherein all may walk and take delight; philosophy is his play-fellow; and the regions of air—the mysteries beyond the skies—the hidden depths of the sea—the secrets deep hidden in the bosom of the earth—the past, with all its old memories—the present, with its crowding wonders—and the future, with its boundless prospects—are to him peculiar possessions, which his liberality divides among the nations of the earth. Saxon valour upholds barbarian thrones; Saxon intelligence and ability preserves the lives of the tribes of heathenism; there is not a monarch in the world, whatever his Pagan faith, who does not covet and pay for the arm and sword of a Saxon. Russia herself, half Tartar and half Christian as she is, owes all that she possesses of good to the Saxon; her fleets are committed to the discipline and bravery of a Saxon admiral; her best soldiers are Saxons, or officered by Saxons; the little literature she has is the produce of plagiarized studies from the Saxon; and the health of the Russian Czar himself is, or was, in the keeping of a Saxon physician.

On the other hand, there is a movement now in progress among the Jews which irresistibly declares a divine interposition. The oppression they have endured in Russia cannot be equivalently described by the pen. It is but a few short months since the world shrieked with disgust at the horrors inflicted on the Hebrew families of Muscovy; and the Czar heard the cry of shame unmoved. New chastisements were ordered, but suddenly came that order for amelioration which, while it startled, made no one grateful for a mercy that seemed to spring from caprice. But that mercy is, humanly speaking, attributed to the cautious interposition of the Grand Duke Michael, who, during his late sojourn in Holland, was made to see much, as well as hear much, of the condition of the Jewish people there. That son of the savage simpleton Paul is less mad, but, report says, not less naturally cruel and ferocious, than his father; and he has so little of the "sucking dove" in him, that for *him* to be touched with compassion at the sufferings of a despised people can be

justly considered as little less than miraculous. Holland has treated that unhappy but interesting people with more consideration than any other nation has done; England has followed her example, not quite *pari passu*, but still at no great distance from her amphibious sister; and if the returning good has not been excessive to ourselves, Holland, at least, has politically found her reward in so doing; and it is doubtful whether the obligation is not rather imposed by the Jews on the Christians, than by the latter on the Jews. We may add Prussia, as a nation friendly to the Israelites, for she, too, mercifully interposed in their behalf when the heel of the Czar was grinding them to blood and dust; and we do not think we are far from correct in our conclusions, when we say that the Protestant Christianity of England, Prussia, and Holland is engaged in working out a great deliverance for the Jews—Popery and the Greek Church to the contrary notwithstanding. One of the results of the vast mission of the divine Baptist was, that he should turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers; and, behold, so it was, for the believing Jews preached Christianity to the Gentiles, in which fact we see the hearts of the fathers of the Old Testament revelation turned to the children of the New; and in hailing the advent of the millennial period, we find the hearts of the Gentile children of the new dispensation becoming turned to the Jewish fathers of the Old.

Judaism is a witness for God, against whom none, not even the Czar, who, in Russian estimation, is God's equal, shall prevail. It has long been as one of the dead witnesses; and when these stand on their feet and prophecy, what is that but life from the dead? Those dry bones shall live! They have long been seen, if not heard, and none shall with impunity even attempt to hide them, or banish the remembrance of them from the earth. When France, drunk with crime and insane from bloody thirst, voted death to be only eternal sleep, and the Godhead a fable—when she would have annihilated the witnesses of the Most High, then the Almighty raised out of their obscurity the Rothschilds from among his ancient people, and the Saxe-Cobourgs, who were of the tribe and lineage of those who, conserving Protestant truth, had also shown greatest kindness to the Jews. And what has been the result? The thrones of Europe rest upon these two families; security, splendour, and successors are derived from one or the other. To the Saxe-Cobourgs have been given the inheritance of the monarchs of Europe. The sceptres of England and of Portugal may be said to be in their hands; and there scarcely exists any

royalty on our old continent of which they do not, at least through marriage, constitute a part. But if their power and greatness be confined to one quarter of the world, the financial importance of the Rothschilds extends over them all. If to influence be to reign, then the destinies of the world are controlled by a family of Israel—a family to which republics look for aid and monarchies for support; failing whom, war could scarcely be proclaimed, and emperors be unwillingly compelled to maintain peace;—the dignity of kingdoms is established through their wealth, and the theatrical appointments of states furnished on the responsibility of their promises to pay. It is impossible to ruminate upon society, as it now exists in its onward course, amidst comparatively a profound peace of now more than a quarter of a century's duration, and to contrast the events of that period with those of the preceding thirty years, without acquiring the conviction, that to the tribes and nations of the earth is given the power of determining, by and with their own will and consent, whether they will work for or against God—whether they will support and cherish, or oppress and destroy, his witnesses. Judaism and Christianity are both of God. Jews and Christians are equally God's witnesses. The long cut off branches will yet be restored and grafted on the true tree; God is powerful for all things, and therefore equal to this: and in the doing of this great work the nations of the world are daily testifying their willingness to become the Lord's active instruments.

A Russian prince, not at all "given to the melting mood," but influenced by Prussia and moved by Holland, has done something, little indeed though it be, towards the improvement of the condition of those Jews who exist under the Czar, but draw no breath without cursing him. Many evils yet threaten that ancient and suffering people in Muscovy, evils which might be stayed by a manly and dignified remonstrance on the part of England. Perhaps the best thing that could happen for the Jews of Russia would be for the Czar to visit the sister now sharing the throne of a country, in the dock-yard of which their common ancestor Peter worked as a common labourer: could he, when there, but be induced to pass through the Jews' quarter in Amsterdam, Nicholas would receive such a lesson as the whole physical power of Europe enlisted in behalf of the Russian Jews, and backed by belligerent success, would fail to convey. We would have desired nothing better, when he, in the teeth of the demonstrated Polish indignation which then awaited him, had the hardihood to visit England—we would have desired nothing better than the appointment of being *cicerone*

of the imperial visitor over the dock-yard at Deptford. Once there, we would certainly have impressed upon his mind an anecdotal fact which he assuredly would not repeat at Oranienbaum; we would have reminded him, that out of that very dock-yard our Queen Anne granted to the Jewish nation timber for the roof of their synagogue then erecting, and still existing, in Bevis Marks. Beams of the requisite size and strength could only be procured, at that time, from the Government stores, where they were lying seasoned and ready for use. And we would, moreover, inform his *Kaiserliche Majestät* that this very timber, in 1698, had been planed, and sawed, and framed, and fashioned, and unconsciously made ready to crown the building of a Jewish synagogue, by the imperial hands of the great progenitor of Nicholas, autocrat of all the Russias! He might derive something from the moral of a tale which exhibits a despot toiling for the outcasts from among men.

In Russia, according to our author—and it is one of the assertions he carries out by proof—there is despotism on the throne and tyranny everywhere. The despotism is so intense that the Emperor will not even allow the Gospel to be preached in his churches, lest it should be a revelation of liberty to the Slaves. With respect to his people, he stands indeed as a shepherd to his sheep—he feeds and kills them. Much has been said of his condescension in the familiar re-unions which he has with the lowest of his subjects, in the presence of the highest of his nobles; but what is the spirit of the condescension?—one of haughty bitterness; for he does not say to his peasant subjects, *you are men, as I am*; but he looks at his lords and mutters—“*Ye are slaves like them.*” His word, though a law, has often the effect of counteracting itself; it is forbidden, in Russian schools, to speak of the death of the Emperor Paul. A more effectual method could not have been adopted to direct the thoughts of men to that very catastrophe. If a lamentable accident happen, with attendant loss of life, the people are commanded not to speak of it. A murdered body is taken up by the police and secretly buried: and had the Deluge itself taken place under a Russian autocracy, there would never have been an author bold enough to tell the truth concerning it to mankind. This system of imposed silence is effected by a second system of secret informers; and as some such fatal officials are to be found in every family, either as friend, casual acquaintance, or servant, no one dare open his lips on a forbidden subject, lest his words be conveyed with exaggeration to the imperial ear. Indeed, there is only one man in Russia who may be spoken with at all, without fear

of the speaker's words being reported, and that man is the Emperor himself!

Truly is it said that the Russian system is rotten before it is ripe. The very imperial palace is a type of the condition of the empire; and not that palace alone, but those of the nobles; and to illustrate fully the impure state into which Russia has fallen, even before she has achieved a palmy quality of greatness, their buildings, vast, magnificent, and imposing to the eye, are half unoccupied, from the hideous and fetid vermin which infect them, and which all the poisoners of Europe cannot destroy. To erect these triumphs of architecture countless workmen have expired; for what is the value of a serf's life compared with an Emperor's will? The summer cottages of the Empress are as unsubstantial as a theatrical scene; and gay, and gilded, and crowded as they are during three months of the year, they are abandoned to solitude and the wolves during the other nine. The imperial fleet is another rotten deception, which flaunts before the world for a few brief summer days, and then falls a victim almost annually to that formidable atmospheric tyranny which can silently corrode to dust the stones of a fortress, that might resist the loud-tongued violence of the whole world's artillery. The monstrous army of Russia exists but upon paper; and from the discharged men which *have* formed a part of it, the Government provides porters for the nobles, servants for the wealthy classes, and beadles for the Church. What becomes of the rest no one seems to know—perhaps the Emperor has decreed that they shall not be spoken of. The Empress herself is one of the greatest slaves in this wide and motley dominion; it is really terrific to read of the dull, unvaried, but never-ceasing round of cheerless dissipation which she is condemned not only to endure, but to take a prominent share in. It is her duty to amuse herself till she expires; and if, in the course of the accomplishment of this frightful task, she fall sick, as even greatness sometimes will, she had better fancy herself amid savages, and leave all to nature, than trust to the deadly quacks of the country, whom it is the patriotic fashion to adopt.

In this empire social dignity of position is everything; the mere dignity of human nature is nothing. The man who has the former may, without scruple, fall upon and maltreat the inferior, who has only the latter to protect him; thus violence is done to the dignity of either position—if either can be said to possess any real dignity, when the spirit of falsehood devours both; when to be a liar does not in any way affect a man's nobility, and when to be a thief is a credit rather than

otherwise to the members of the lower orders. Among the latter, indeed, such a passion, in addition to that of drunkenness, exists for stealing, that they excuse themselves by uttering a profanity, which we only repeat, because it illustrates a double vice in those who commit the deed, and proffer an apology which says that Christ himself would have been a thief, if he had not had his hands pierced ! The debauchery and dissipation of all classes, but particularly of the highest, and *that* especially in Moscow, were even frightful to M. de Custine, who knows something about the "Mysteries of Paris." The excesses we cannot repeat ; the actors in them partake equally both of drunkards and demons ; even the women of the noble classes do not escape the contagion—lazy by disposition, gamblers by passion, resplendent in public as the princesses of the Persian Tales, and more dirty and repulsive in private than all the imaginary *Cenerentole* can reveal to us—compounds of falsehood and flattery, as naturally cruel as they are fair—they are one entire deception ; and their very boasted politeness is but the result of vanity to display what they consider a good education. And then these excesses, vices, faults, and follies may all be traced to the system of government by which they are engendered. The great object of life seems to be self-forgetfulness ; no one dare abandon himself to reflection. In Russia, conversation is conspiracy ; to think is to rebel ; indeed, thought there is not merely a crime—it is a positive misfortune. We almost rejoice that the space allotted us will not permit of our noticing this subject any further ; our readers will find an interest, alternately attractive and revolting, in perusing the pages of M. de Custine, devoted to life in Russia ; we can only give the following passage, from the original, as illustrative of the good sense and the charity of those who are the slaves of a czar and the pupils of a drunken priest :—

"Une dame Française émigrée, âgée, et spirituelle, était établie dans une ville de province. Un jour, elle alla faire une visite à une personne du pays. Il y a dans plusieurs maisons Russes des escaliers couverts des trappes, et qui sont dangereux. La dame Française qui n'avait pas remarqué une de ces soupesses trompeuses, tombe d'une quinzaine de pieds de haut sur des marches de bois. Que fait la maîtresse de la maison ? Vous auriez peine à le deviner. Sans vouloir même s'assurer si la malheureuse est morte ou vivante, sans courir à elle pour s'informer de son état, sans appeler du secours, sans envoyer au moins chercher un chirurgien, elle plante la l'accident ; et court dévotement s'enfermer à son oratoire pour prier la St. Vierge de venir en aide à la pauvre morte—morte ou blessée, selon, ce qu'il aura plu au bon Dieu d'en ordonner. Cependant la blessée, non morte, et qui n'avait rien de cassé, eut le temps de se relever, et remonter dans l'antichambre, et de se faire ramener chez elle, avant que sa pieuse amie avait quitté son prie-Dieu.

On ne put même arracher celle-ci de cet asile qu'en lui criant à travers la porte, que l'accident n'avait eu aucune suite grave, et que la malade était retournée chez elle, où elle venait de se coucher ; mais par pure précaution. Aussitôt la charité active se reveille dans le cœur désolé de la bonne devote Russe, qui reconnoissante de l'efficacité de ses prières, court officieusement chez son amie, insiste pour entrer, arrive auprès du lit de la patiente, et l'accable de protestations d'intérêt, qui la privent pendant une heure au moins du repos dont elle a besoin. Ce trait d'enfantillage me fut conté par la personne même à qui l'accident est arrivé. Si elle se fut cassé la jambe, ou évanouit, elle aurait pu mourir sans secours, à la place où l'avait laissée sa pieuse amie. Après cela on s'étonne de voir des hommes tomber dans la Neva, et s'y noyer, sans que personne pense à leur porter secours, sans même que l'on ose parler de leur mort !"

Our readers will agree with us, that we have, by this time, said enough of the Russians among themselves ; we will, then, conclude our notice by giving them an idea of the humanity of these people to their prisoners. The captives to whom we refer were indeed French invaders—men naturally hateful to a people even as little attached to their native soil as the Muscovites, and who were the miserable victims of a leader who made men of no value but to climb up to the bauble of ambition above him. The account, which we borrow from the author's appendix, is too long to give in detail ; its most important parts we can, however, lay before our readers ; they will find in it an episode of glorious war, likely to disgust them, with the fiendish strife which, by the bad passions of men, has been rendered a necessary evil in the world.

M. Girard, the officer from whose lips M. de Custine received his information, was made prisoner during the retreat from Moscow. Under a Cossack escort, he was despatched into the interior, with a convoy of three thousand fellow captives. The cold daily increased in intensity ; and in conveying the prisoners beyond Moscow, the intention was to disperse them through the different governments of the interior. Dying with hunger and fatigue, these children of misery were driven forward, if they halted but for a moment to breathe, by the most cruel beating. The stick, indeed, served them, as it were, for food ; it gave them, at least, strength enough to walk forward to death. The man who fell was frozen fast to the earth, and was a corpse. Devoured by vermin, and wasting with fever and wretchedness, they carried contagion about with them ; and the peasantry saw their approach with horror. By the stick they were beaten till they reached the doors of the huts destined for their resting-place ; and by the stick beaten back when they attempted to enter. Their condition was occasionally such, that, in a moment of frenzy and famine, they rushed upon one another, slaying each other with billets

of wood, with large stones, or even with nothing but their hands ; and when this frightful contest ceased, the hungry survivors sat down and devoured the bodies of the vanquished ! At night, too, in the bivouacs, the men who felt death coming over them, started to their feet, to struggle, standing, against the agony ; overcome by the cold while in the contortions of death, they remained stiff and cold, leaning against the walls. Their last perspiration turned to ice on their fleshless limbs ; their eyes were glaringly fixed open, and their bodies stood erect in the convulsive attitudes in which death had surprised and frozen them. The carcases remained there till torn from the spot to be burnt ; the instep separating from the foot with greater facility than the sole came away from the ground to which it was glued. As day dawned, their comrades, looking up, saw themselves under the guard of a circle of statues, that had scarcely become cold, and who appeared posted about the camp like the advanced sentinels of another world. We can well believe M. Girard when he says that the horrors of such an awakening defy description. Every morning, previous to the departure of the column, the Russians burned the dead, and sometimes—the dying !

From an Italian officer, named Grassini, whom M. de Custine encountered at Milan only two years ago, he received an account of like atrocities, which we will condense, with the single remark, that our author found these men, who had passed ten years in Russia, so impressed, even twenty years after they had left that country, with the terror of Russian influence and *espionage* being still around them, that it was only with the greatest reluctance, and in whispers, that they imparted to him the terrible facts connected with their sufferings. He relates, in another passage of his book, a similar instance of the effects of despotism in a young Italian, who, speaking in Paris of things he had witnessed in St. Petersburg, spoke in so low a tone, that, on being asked why he used such bated breath, answered, that the Emperor did not like such matters being discussed !

M. Grassini, to whom we must, however, return, was captured during the retreat, at Smolensko. He suffered intensely from the cold, but he met with some instances of humanity from several female peasants, as well as noble ladies, who sent to him and his comrades clothing to protect them from the weather ; remedies to relieve their disease ; food, and linen. He acknowledges the general hardness of heart which he encountered in Russia, where the laws, customs, morals, and dispositions are stamped with cruelty ; but, as he truly adds of woman's heart—" *Partout où il y a des femmes, il y a de la*

pitié ; et les femmes de tous les pays sont quelquefois héroïques dans la compassion." He and his companions travelled in divisions ; they were not permitted to stop in the villages, on account of the hospital fever they bore with them. At night they lay on the ground, encamped between two large fires. When morning came, the dead were counted, and in place of burying them, which would have required more time than could be spared, and, in consequence of the depth of the snow and the hardness of the ice, more trouble than they were inclined to bestow, they were burnt. It was imagined that by this process the spread of the contagion would be checked ; clothes and body were given together to the flames, and men yet alive were often tossed into the fire with them !—these latter, reinvigorated for an instant by excess of pain, ended their agony with the shrieks and torments of victims at the stake. Each night the cold decimated what the previous night had spared ; and these nights, passed occasionally in old, ruined, and abandoned houses, in the vicinity of towns, where, from the crowds that were driven into them, it was impossible to kindle a fire, were more fatal than those spent in the open air, when their encampment was surrounded by watch-fires. From this wretched refuge M. Grassini often saw the Russian soldiery take the dead from the upper rooms. The bodies were dragged out by cords thrown round the ancles, and the head followed, striking and rebounding against every step from the top of the house to the bottom. A good constitution, stout heart, indomitable courage, and trust in Providence, supported the author of this narrative through the horrors which he daily witnessed, and under which he saw his fellow-soldiers sink.

"As soon (says he) as I arrived in a town where I could find a superior officer, I asked for permission to enter the Russian service—it was one method of escaping the journey into Siberia. My request was considered, and in the course of a few weeks I was sent to Toulâ, where I was appointed tutor to the son of the civil governor of the town. In that man's house I passed two years. My pupil was a child of twelve years of age. He was attached to me, for I loved him. He informed me that his father was a widower, that he had purchased a female peasant in Moscow for a concubine, and that this woman did not tend to make the house a happy one. The governor himself was a melo-dramatic tyrant, who considered that dignity consisted in silence. During the two years that I dined at his table, no conversation ever passed between us. He kept a buffoon for his amusement—a blind man, whom he compelled to sing during the whole time of our repast, and whom he excited to speak, in my presence, against the French people, army, and prisoners. I knew enough of

Russians to guess at a part of these indecent and brutal pleasantries, the full meaning of which my pupil did not fail to interpret when we had returned to our apartment."

When M. Grassani first arrived in the house of this man, whose delicacy of feeling was thus generously expressed, he was stripped of everything. It was necessary, however, that he should have *some* dress, and the governor, consequently, had the liberality to order his tailor to furnish him with one of his own cast-off suits; and in this attire he did not blush to see the man stand in presence of the son to whom he had given him as an instructor. The leisure hours of the two years of captivity passed here were spent by the prisoner in carefully writing his memoirs. He had in this way completed two volumes of the most curious facts—facts more extraordinary than any that have been hitherto printed on the same subject. He had described every circumstance he had witnessed; but, alas! fear, and, in his case, a wise and well-founded fear, induced him to burn it before he reached the Russian frontier, when he had received permission to return to Italy. "If those papers had been found upon me (says he), I should have been condemned to the knout, and to perpetual imprisonment in Siberia." The same fear appears still to have its influence upon *him*, and also on M. Girard. The latter was detained in Russia during a longer captivity, and when, after ten years of forced teaching in the imperial schools, he was allowed to set out for France, he does so in the spirit of a Chinese criminal, who thanks the executioner who has half killed him with the bamboo—returning thanks for the *hospitality* he has received from his Russian masters. This mysterious influence, we say, has not yet left him, for on M. de Custine pressing him with questions upon the subject of his captivity, his reply is—"On receiving my passport, I was strongly recommended to be discreet!"

Here we conclude, observing again, that though we leave M. de Custine with a most unfavourable impression of the Russian Government, people, and religion, we do not place entire reliance upon *every* illustration he brings forward against a people he pre-eminently dislikes. Some of his most suspicious passages are prefaced by such assurances of their being undoubtedly true, that we are reminded of what an Ispahanee says whenever he is about to impose upon you—"You may believe me (says that member of a nation of liars), for, though a Persian, I am going to tell you the truth!" We do not mean to assert that the author willingly imposes upon his readers, but he constantly compels them to remember that

prejudice is so near akin to falsehood, and the family likeness between them so strong, that one may easily be mistaken for the other. We have no doubt of his utter abhorrence of anything that is not true, since he says that truth with him is a passion; and yet, for a gentleman so passionately attached to so respectable a virtue, he does condescend to peccadilloes that we cannot reconcile with the flourish of trumpets with which they are introduced. Thus he often extracts information from unwilling persons, under the assurance that he is no author, and shall not repeat in writing what they may please to impart; and yet the information is no sooner obtained, than a whole night is passed in committing it to paper. Again, he professes to write in the most profound secrecy, and under the greatest dread, lest his letters should be discovered by the Russian Government: he alludes, in a species of pen-and-ink whisper, to the mysterious places in which his manuscripts are concealed, and yet, in an unguarded moment, he talks of carrying them about with him in a portfolio—showing that his ideas of concealment are something akin to those entertained by village poultry, who thrust their heads under barn doors, and fancy nobody can see their tails. Nor have we much admiration for his method of gaining information with regard to society in general. M. de Custine's plan is nearly altogether to keep away from it, and then write his impressions. He would judge our Royal Academy exhibition, perhaps, by visiting the Dulwich Gallery; and decide upon the merits of a pudding by merely looking at the plums. It is after some such fashion that he judges of Walter Scott, because he has read Shakespeare; and thinking, as he does, that the French gained that battle of Toulouse which was won by our own Duke, he holds it the very acmé of impudence and immorality that the Russians should claim the victory at the Moskowa.

But we take what M. de Custine condescends to give us, grateful for that (and it is not little) on which we can depend; and, in our literary civility, intimating, rather than bluntly expressing, a doubt, where the latter might well be raised. Thus, when he arrives at a conclusion by means which we cannot divine, we are inclined to mingle the politeness and the curiosity which we have learned from the Knight of La Mancha. Our readers may recollect, that when the Princess Micomicoma fell into a most egregious blunder, the chivalrous Don never so much as hints a suspicion of her not having acted precisely as she had stated, but only begs to know her reasons for having taken a step so extraordinary. "But, pray, madam (says he), why *did* your ladyship land at Omsuna, seeing that it is not a sea-port town?"

ART. V.—*England's Trust, and other Poems.* By Lord JOHN MANNERS, M.P. London: Rivingtons.

THE age in which we live is one affording subject matter for solemn thoughts and deep reflection. It is full of signs and portents; it contains in its experience the summing up of the past, and in its continually advancing progress an inductive realization of that future in the hope of which holy men have lived and died. A new dispensation is in the dawn; and though it cannot shine forth with glorious effulgence till the present has utterly fulfilled its work and passed away, yet there are significant indications on every hand that some mighty event is not far distant, which philosophers may call a "great moral revolution," but which the Christian believes to be the period spoken of by St. Paul, as that for which "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain"—for which "the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth"—"the manifestation of the sons of God"—the deliverance of the creature itself "from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

It is a common observation that the world is growing old. There is much of poetical fancy in the idea, but there is also, as in all remarks which take the form of popular proverbs, much of truth. The *poetry* is in the likening of the world to the life of man, with its ages of infancy, manhood, and decrepitude—the *truth* is in the fact, that there is, and ever has been, a progression of events to a certain end, and that they are now evidently ripening to a consummation, wherein the destinies of all seem to be involved, and by the development of which, not only nations, but individuals, will be affected. To this thinking men of all classes, however otherwise opposed, agree; and whether it be in the foreboding tone of the Oxford school, in the deep dreamings of an intangible future so manifest in all its poetry, or the powerful and caustic philippics of Mr. Carlyle—whether it be in the prophetic calculations of the excellent Mr. Cuninghame of Lamehaw, or the present desperate political experiments of thwarted statesmen—the same conviction is expressed, however differently, that the past has nearly done its work, and that the events of a period are about to be revealed, to which the faith of the Church has been in all ages intelligently directed—to which, though it be incomprehensible to unbelieving men, they look forward with fearful curiosity, as containing the solution of their doubts—the confirmation or destruction of their theories.

We are instructed that the times and seasons are in the

hand of God. They have been all appointed by him for a certain end ; whilst to every one a special work has been ordained, having its special place in the progressive development and final consummation of his purpose. In the accomplishment of this purpose the ages of the past have each had their peculiar characteristics, and in their events have each exhibited man in some one or other of the many phases of his nature ; so that almost all the powers and capacities wherewith he has been endowed have been called into action. The patriarchal ages, the Assyrian dynasties, the Egyptian era, the philosophy of Greece, the domination of Rome, the feudality of the middle ages, the attainments of modern civilization, the darkness of Paganism, and the blessed and benign influences of Christianity, have each exhibited him in perhaps all the several aspects which he can possibly assume ; and little in this dispensation now remains to be unfolded of the history of his being. It wants but the few last chapters, containing the further and final development of that which is spiritual in him—the conclusion, wherein the events of the past shall be gathered together, and the one great end for which they have been permitted be made manifest.

It is not difficult to assign to each age its characteristic, nor the exact period in this history to which it answers. Some one great event, calling forth the latent powers of human nature into operation, may be pointed to, whose results mark an era, and prove a fresh step attained in the progression of man onwards. The world has seen him, in the days when princes were shepherds, in the perfection of his physical being ; the triumphs of philosophy and learning have given full scope to the exercise of the intellectual ; and the region of the spiritual, darkly dreamed of in the *μυθoi* of the ancients, has been entered into, and is now developing its mysteries. When man shall have been permitted to manifest what properly belongs to him, and what he can properly attain to in this respect, his work in this world will be over, and that which belongs to him in another shall commence. In the meanwhile, as he is born to immortality, he must advance ; the principle of life which he has received from God implies development ; and though his spiritual being be like his natural, in that both have life, yet there is this difference—that as progression leads in the one to decay and decrepitude, there is no old age in the other. It is a continual advance through the successive stages of temporal into eternal existence ; and though there be bounds and limits within which, so long as we are in the body, the mental and even the spiritual are confined, yet that they pro-

gress till they touch these bounds cannot be doubted by any one who looks back upon the past and considers the present. Because they do so, some have rashly and impiously assumed that there are in this earthly condition no bounds at all. The effort to pass them, or the belief that they do not exist, is one characteristic feature of the present day. We have attained to a knowledge of scientific principles hitherto undreamed of—we have succeeded in classifying and arranging almost all the phenomena of nature, till we have discovered their source and systematized their operations. Much that was an enigma to our fathers we have resolved; and it is therefore vainly and arrogantly reasoned, that all spiritual and mental phenomena are capable of a similar classification and solution, and that we want but a little more experience to aid us in ascertaining the laws and principles which regulate the operation of the spiritual and intellectual, as precisely as we have learned the nature of those which are the causes of all results in the physical. Thus men hope to touch the throne of God itself—to reduce the mysteries of heaven to the solution of mathematical demonstration—and, by bringing the spiritual into subjection to fixed laws, of whose nature they are cognizant and whose operations they can direct, to materialize the divine nature and deify man! The great mystery and sin of the tower of Babel is again enacting, to meet with a like result. Men have attained a height which intoxicates them with the hope of success, and many are beginning to believe that it is reserved for the attainments of science and the power of human sagacity to penetrate into the nature of those deep and mighty secrets which God has hitherto kept hidden from man, to be revealed only in His own good time and in His own good way. Not a few of the disciples of mesmerism are indulging these rash hopes and expectations—some even to the folly of supposing that they may succeed in raising the dead! Though there is undoubtedly somewhat of quackery, and it may be of collusion, in many of their experiments, yet it is notto be denied that they have produced results for which there is no accounting by any known law; and they are emboldened to assert that these results, being so many proofs of the existence of a law, it needs but a better acquaintance with them to ascertain the exact nature of that law, and bring its operations under our control. Now, whilst it is rash to say that there are no undiscovered laws of mental association of whose nature we are at present ignorant, it is equally presumptuous to suppose that their discovery will ever render us independent of that condition to which we are bound by the very nature of

our existence in this dispensation—a condition to which sin has brought us, and from which, though we have been redeemed, virtually, by the work of our blessed Lord, we cannot be released till the time ordained for the manifestation of all the fruits of that redemption.

Though we have said that each age has its characteristic, which it is not difficult to discover, this is a remark which, strictly speaking, scarcely applies to the present; for its peculiarity is not in one, but many characteristics—rather in the cumulated possession and application of all that has distinguished the past, whether of good or of evil, than in the manifestation of any one distinctive feature of its own. In every way we are reaping, by easy processes, the fruits of those seeds which our pains-taking fathers sowed with labour, and not unfrequently with suffering. Since the commencement of the present century knowledge has increased, and the application of scientific principles to practical purposes has been effected in a ratio of rapidity hitherto unknown. For many generations the materials have been gradually accumulating, and nothing was wanting but the perception or discovery of master principles to bring the whole into order—to assign to every fact its proper place, and render the successive experience of past ages available to the wants and uses of the present. For some wise purpose this has been permitted, whether for good or evil; that which was the result and reward of years of labour and research, is now brought down to the comprehension of the lowest, and rendered intelligible in the popular lecture of an hour. It is not that we have mightier men amongst us—men wiser than any who have preceded them; it is not that we surpass those who have gone before us in quality of mind or brilliancy of genius—there are proofs enough in the world of the contrary: noble edifices, which proudly defy competition; paintings, over which the despairing artist lingers for years, in the hope of catching inspiration from their contemplation; works of deep thought and gigantic intellect, which the ready but dwarfish writers of the present day seek in vain to fathom and to imitate: whilst ever and anon, amidst the scenes of fierce contention and passion which history records, leaders and statesmen appear, whose difficulties and whose mastery of intellect have never been surpassed. It is not in intellectual *quality*, but *quantity*, that this generation surpasses all others. The man of thought or genius of former times was an exception to his day; he was the creator of his own renown, as he was the originator of that for which he was distinguished; but what he accomplished has become common

property, and many, in making the results of his labours their own, and adopting what they could not have discovered, have thereby attained an elevation which does not properly belong to them, and given a character of intellectuality to the age, which is rather owing to its position in the scale of time than to anything inherently superior in the mental constitution of the men who live in it.

Though it be true, however, that there are none greater now than those who have gone before us, it must not be forgotten that, in whatever way it has been attained, all have learned to think, if not on just grounds and to wholesome results—if not to such extent as shall prevent the danger of superficiality—so far, at least, as to found pretensions for a claim to the exercise of judgment in all things that are passing around them, and a share in the decision of the weightiest matters that can affect the interests of man. The time for the existence of the *negative*, in thought or action, has for ever passed away; all must have an opinion, if not a principle, by which to stand or fall; and he who is not capable of forming one for himself, of necessity becomes attached to some party, adopts the opinions of others, and uses the ability he has in giving himself some show of ownership when required to expound them. One result of this is, the assumption of positions which do not rightly and naturally belong to men—the displacing of some classes, and the almost total extinction of others, in the intellectual order. The schoolmaster, in one sense, is, indeed, abroad—for his occupation, as a *master*, is well nigh gone; all have become teachers, or imagine themselves to have passed beyond the region of *the taught*. The schools of antiquity, where the many listened with well-grounded reverence to the teaching of the few, qualified for their office by unwearied study and pains-taking thought, have yielded to establishments for “mutual instruction” and popular *Athenæums*, where knowledge is acquired through the medium of a polite communication, which treats ignorance as an accident, and leaves no man room to suppose that he is less intelligent or less skilful than his brother. That God has made men to differ in capacity and ability is almost an exploded heresy; some faint adherence to the doctrine is now and then discovered in the admissions of a few, but little or no faith, in its reality, is exhibited in the practical educational schemes of the day. It is true that we have our Universities, which, though not unaffected by the stormy and contentious elements that rage around them, yet preserve their wonted dignity and superiority, and send forth from time to time men into every influential

class of society, fitted, as far as they are individually concerned, to grace the positions which they are called to occupy, though not always sufficiently prepared to meet the difficulties that await them; so that, whether the Church or the State be doomed to fall before the spirit that is abroad, they will not either of them lack a mantle wherein to meet beneath its graceful folds the blow that seals their fate—eloquence for their defence—nor poetry for their mourning. But the Universities are the creations of other times—they retain and breathe the spirit of the days which brought them into being—and their children are not altogether fitted to understand and meet the moral exigencies of an age so practical and utilitarian as the present. The gentle and the dignified—the honourable and the high-minded—come forth from her halls with many a poetic vision and excellent resolve, but they are too often soon bewildered and lost in the rough jostle of contending thousands. Doubtless, in their several spheres, they do somewhat ameliorate or better the condition of their fellows; but they are pitted against an antagonist of whose existence they have scarcely heard—of whose hard, unyielding nature, iron strength, and heartless demands they have not dreamed—the fierce, stern spirit of democratic rule, which will not be conciliated by gentle breeding nor classic lore; and they are speedily wearied or out-matched. The *prestige* which learning gave is well nigh gone, whilst in every hamlet some ramification of the widely-spreading evil is found—some demagogue or bitter divider—to instil discontent towards the landlord and contempt for the pastor. Reverence has almost ceased to have an existence, save in poetical conceptions; faith has given place to logic, the heart to the head; and men ask for definitions, for proofs, and demonstrations upon every moral precept that is set before them, as though conscience were a problem, and right conduct a matter for mathematical solution. Even divine truth must not be *asserted*, but *proposed*; and the clergyman who, believing in the nature and sacred character of his office, declares the word of God “with authority,” however he may acquit his conscience in so doing, runs no small risk of losing his reputation as an intelligent and enlightened man. We know that dogmatism and intolerance go hand in hand, and a wholesome impatience of them is both natural and proper to man; but these, if anywhere, are to be found amongst the popular party of the day, who, in their advocacy of liberty and liberal opinions, make it evident, by their method of doing so, how little real understanding they have of the things which they profess.

Whilst deploring, however, the absence of reverence gene-

rally, we have but little sympathy with a class of amiable and intellectual men who waste their talents and energies in mourning for the past, instead of exerting them to meet the necessities of the present. One of them has written—

“Let crowded cities and extensive towns
Sink into hamlets and unpeopled downs ;
Let trade and commerce, law and learning, die,
But give us still our old nobility.”

The sentiment contained in these lines has been severely criticized ; and they would not now be noticed, were it not that, in a measure, they express the views of a party, and afford an illustration of a remark which we wish to make—viz., that to mourn for the past is not the work required of any one who is called to a place of trust and authority ; but to meet on its own ground, and master, if that be possible, the dangerous spirit that is abroad. We are disposed to think that the sentiment expressed in the lines which we have quoted was not, as it stands at present, seriously contemplated—that the meaning has been less considered than the rhythm. If so, probably the author has by this time learned that good poetry does not always, if indeed ever, consist in the absence of good sense. A condition of society without “trade and commerce, law and learning,” but consisting of (what is implied) an untaught peasantry and an “old nobility,” is meaningless—it is a condition which cannot now exist. Where there is an “old nobility,” there must have been some national standing in Christendom : and it is of a Christian land, we presume, that these lines treat ; and a national standing supposes, in some degree, both trade and commerce, law and learning. The wish, moreover, while it is meaningless, implies neither knowledge nor philanthropy—knowledge as to the real nature of the thing desired, nor philanthropy in wishing such a condition restored. A land without law or learning, but with an old nobility, suggests to us, as the nearest approach to it, the days of Malcolm Canmore, when none, we believe, throughout his realms, could write their names, and when law was constituted by the strongest arm and the keenest sword ; whilst the closest resemblance that we know of to a national aristocracy, existing in states where there were neither trade nor commerce, is only to be found in the early monarchical branches of the Scythian tribes. If “*Young England*” desire to see the revival of such as these we are much mistaken ; there are too many noble hearts and Christian thoughts amongst the party so called to warrant such a supposition for a moment. It is to the “old nobility” of the feudal system that the

writer whom we have quoted would doubtless allude. The baron, in his pride of hall and plenitude of retainers; the bishop, in his mitred state and princely palace; the abbot and his monastery, in the vigour of ecclesiastic rule and daily dole to the surrounding poor. But trade and commerce were necessary even to the baron, and learning to the Churchman; and there was a proportion in which the prosperity of the one depended upon the existence of the other. Moreover, it should never be forgotten, that whilst the feudal system compelled, as a necessary consequence, a care for the bodily condition of the poor, it had no place for them as men—as beings of soul, and mind, and heart; it degraded their whole moral condition, and put them on a level with the war-horse of their masters.

Nothing, indeed, can be more false or exaggerated than the laudatory estimates which are formed of the feudal times—estimates which are attained not so much from the consideration of facts, as from the scenic decoration with which the historical and popular romances of the present day have been clothed by their talented authors. The gay groupings of belted knights and their retainers; the stirring descriptions of battle-fields; chivalrous deeds, and the ever-changing action of these days of strife, have, when they are set before us in these works, so great charm, that we have no thought for the domestic misery and discomfort, the tyranny and oppression, that are left out of sight: as they who look upon mimic representations of happiness, or of pomp, in a theatre, little think how much paint and poverty, dirt, disorder, and dissipation exist behind the scenes, and go to make up and furnish the simulations of domestic comfort and royal pageantry. There is, too, a powerful spell in silence and the grave; and wherever we find ourselves called upon, by association, to think of those who are gone, it is rather as we would desire them to be, than as they really were. Hence, from a feeling both natural and beautiful, when we have to think of that which is no more, it is oftentimes in forms of great illusion. We look at old baronial halls in their ruins, and they have for us, in their desolate and broken condition, a touching interest; we give to every stone a voice and every spot an action; we sit down to create a vision, and yield ourselves to faith in it, as though it were true; we people these halls with noble and hospitable hosts, and love happy guests, and mourn at the contrast between the stately baron and his bold peasantry, and the monied aristocracy and pale starving artizan of modern times. Far be it from us to destroy such gentle dreamings recklessly; but, forasmuch as these same pale starving artizans demand all the help that we

can bring them, and are the men with whom we have now to do; forasmuch as the living claim so largely our sympathy, that, if it be rightly given, there will be none to spare; 'tis not amiss to remember that there is another side of this picture, which we shall do well to consider. The baron was not unfrequently a robber chief, who *harried*, whenever he had plausible grounds for so doing, the lands of his less powerful neighbour; and he fed his retainers with profuseness out of that which he had acquired without honesty. The peasantry had neither life nor liberty which they could call their own, whilst an element existed, which has ever been found destructive of romance, in the filth and dirt of the domestic dwellings of the period. Erasmus, for instance, even in his day, gives a curious account of the condition of the floors, which were strewn from time to time with rushes, the old layers never being removed, whereon the bones of the repast and all manner of refuse were thrown, yielding sights and smells that were scarcely bearable; whilst, if we mistake not, we have read of a nobleman, so late as the reign of Elizabeth, who gives as a reason for moving from one country house to another, that this practice, during a six months' residence, had created so great a stench as to render a removal absolutely necessary.

As regards the moral condition of the "old nobility," we must say a word or two more. Madox's "History of the Exchequer" affords ample proof, in the curious instances which it recites, that it was one not to be envied, both as regards that to *which* they were subjected in the way of fine and amercement, and that for *which* they were so subjected. The king, for example, was not ashamed to exact fines on the slightest pretences; his court was not open to any that did not bring a bribe in their hand; justice was openly bought and sold; and his rapacity was as much shown in the meanness of the bribe offered, where nothing else was possessed, as in the sacred nature of those obligations that were broken through. On the other hand, some of the graver offences for which his nobles were amerced, whilst they bring a broad light to bear upon the fierce-passioned and rough-handed condition of society, do not say much for the safety or security of a people, the violation of whose lives and honour was ever a fruitful source of increasing the royal revenue. Now, that which the king did with his nobles, the nobles did with their vassals; and it is simply because it was so that we have cited the conduct of him who, as the head of the feudal system, was the chief exponent of its nature. Whoever is at all accustomed to genealogical researches will also have acquired a knowledge of facts, bearing

upon the condition of society in the middle ages, which will help him to look through the golden mists wherewith the glory of chivalry has enshrouded the past, and discover the reality—for there is scarcely a noble family in England which does not, in its earlier records, along with much that is high-minded and courageous, furnish relations of rapacity, cruelty, and oppression. Nor was the condition of the lords ecclesiastic much better. Against Robert the Norman, Archbishop of Canterbury, who came over with Queen Emma, and his followers, “many bills were presented, some containing matter of rape, other of robbery, extortion, murder, manslaughter, high treason, adultery, and not a few of battery.” Ranulph, Bishop of Chichester, who had sided with Anselm, made no small revenue out of the fines of such of his priests as were convicted of gross crimes.

“In the days of Henry I. (says Polydor), the bishops were blinded with covetousness and ambition, not considering that it was their duty to despise such worldly pomp as the people regard, and that their calling required a studious endeavour for the health of such souls as fell to their charge; neither yet remembered they the simplicity of Christ, and his contempt of worldly dignity, when he refused to satisfy the humour of the people, who very desirously would have made him a king, but withdrew himself, and departed to a mountain himself alone; they were rather infected with the ambition of the apostles, contending one with another for the primacy, forgetting the vocation whereto Christ had separated them; not to rule as kings over the Gentiles, but to submit their necks to the yokes of obedience, as they had Christ, their Master, an example and precedent.”

When Henry II. quarrelled with à Becket, upon most just grounds, the condition of the clergy was fearful in the extreme.

“Crimes of the deepest die, murders, robberies, adulteries, rapes, were daily committed by the ecclesiastics. It had been found, for instance, on enquiry, that no less than one hundred murders had, since the king’s accession (less than ten years) been perpetrated by men of that profession, who had never been called to account for these offences; and holy orders were become a full protection for all enormities.”

Of the bellicose propensities of these spiritual nobles many instances are on record. Old Wace, in his “Chronicles of the Norman Conquest,” recounts, with great unction, the valiant deeds of Odo, Bishop of Baieux, who came over in William’s train. The episcopal seals of some of the prelates, especially those of Durham, display their effigies fully harnessed for war, with helm as well as mitre. On one occasion the retinues of the Archbishops of York and Canterbury fought, in the presence of the king, upon some disputed point as to which of

these should place the crown upon his head ; and in " Grafton's Chronicle" there is this story, which we give *verbatim*, only altering the spelling :—

" In the sixteenth of King William's reign (the Conqueror) there fell an unhappy strife between Thurstan, Abbot of Glastonbury, being a Norman, and his monks ; the cause whereof (in part, saith Fabian) was, that the abbot despised, and would have set apart, such song and offices as by Gregory, Bishop of Rome, and Augustin, his disciple, of old time, was to them assigned, and would have compelled them to have followed the use of William of Fescampe. And beside that, this Thurstan wasted and inordinately spent the goods of that place in lechery, and by other insolent means, and withdrew from the monks their old and accustomed diet. For the which causes first began great words with chiding ; and after, strokes and fights, so that the abbot got unto him armed men, and fell upon the monks, and slew two of them at the high altar, and wounded eighteen of them ; and the monks, with forms and candlesticks, defended themselves in such wise, that they hurt many of the armed men."

Of the luxury of the priests of the Norman period in England, Hollingshed gives a curious account, drawn from contemporary documents—

" They went (he says) in divers colours, like players, in garments of light hue, as yellow, red, green, &c., with their shoes piked, their hair crisped, their girdles armed with silver, their shoes, spurs, bridles, &c., buckled with like metal ; their apparel for the most part of silk, and richly furred ; their caps laced and buttoned with gold : so that to meet a priest in those days was to behold a peacock, that spreadeth his tail when he danceth before the hen."

The abbots lived in the enjoyment of great pomp and state. St. Bernard speaks, in his writings, of having seen an abbot at the head of six hundred horsemen, who served him as a *cortege*.

" By the pomp (he says) which these dignitaries exhibit, you would take them, not for superiors of monasteries, but for the lords of castles ; not for the directors of consciences, but for the governors of provinces. A Benedictine abbot once frankly confessed—' My vow of poverty has given me one hundred thousand crowns a year—my vow of obedience has raised me to the rank of a sovereign prince.'"

And this condition of princely state had its fruits, as might naturally be supposed ; for the abbots were even at strife with the bishops, desiring to be independent of their jurisdiction ; and their efforts not only proved a source of continual disturbance to the Church, but oftentimes involved the lives and fortunes of those who were feudally dependent upon them.

If these instances were exceptions, it would be most unfair to adduce them in proof of a condition of society ; but they are

not—they are met with in almost every page of the history of the feudal ages, and are not to be considered simply as examples of abuse, but as necessary consequences, furnishing a legitimate exposition of the nature and working of a system. It may be said, that what was excellent and worthy of imitation has been utterly overlooked in these remarks ; that there was, notwithstanding much evil, great good ; and that, in the amount of hospitality, of noble endowments of religious and charitable communities on the part of laymen, and in bountiful provision for the wants of the poor on the part of the Church, these ages have never been surpassed, and are worthy of our imitation. A fierce opponent might answer, that the amount of hospitality was no real test of right feeling or principles ; that the Earl of Warwick, for example, who is said to have fed thirty thousand daily, was, though a profuse host, a bad subject ; that religious houses were often endowed by men who had spent their lives in violence and rapine, as some atonement for their sin ; and that the daily dole of the monasteries would probably have been more, had the costly living of the monks been less. But the opposition would be ungenerous ; and we frankly admit that there were many things in this condition of society worthy our deep consideration and praise. It would be well if, in looking back, this mercenary age, with its legislative enactments for the saving of pounds, shillings, and pence, at the expense of the high and honourable character for Christian charity which the nation has ever borne, and to the wrong and crushing of the poor ; it would be well, when poverty is considered as a crime, and treated as such—when men, for every penny they give to God's service, count, with utilitarian nicety, what return of personal benefit it will bring them ; it would be well if we could learn a lesson from the past, and, without seeking to revive it—a thing which is impossible—extract from it all that is really commendable ; for whilst we still assert that the state of society, during the actual prevalence of the feudal system, was, without doubt, very barbarous, it must be admitted that it had its uses, and, in the purpose of God and the progression of man towards an end, fulfilled its place. It brought amongst men elements of stability and advancement previously unknown, preserving what was good, and preparing the ground for further cultivation ; it is to be regarded as the step between the earlier past and present, which it is most useful to contemplate, but not desirable nor possible to revive.

We take the liberty of remarking, further, that though a preference for "hamlets and unpeopled downs," over "crowded

cities and extensive towns," indicates, in some respects, an amiable mind, it betrays an ignorance of the purpose for which God has formed us, and the duty to which he has called us. It is a preference, too, which ought to have little place in patriotism, for Hollingshed justly remarks, "the decay of a people is the destruction of a kingdom." Of all the works which have issued from the hand of our Maker, man is the noblest and fairest. For him the universe was made; without him creation was not complete. When, through his sin, all that God had put into his power went down with him into suffering and death, it was only by his redemption that the fallen creation could be rescued from the hand of the enemy, and that every part of it could be made to fulfil, wholesomely and properly, the purposes of its being. It was manhood that was taken by our blessed Lord when he came forth from the bosom of his Father, and was incarnate, he ceasing not to be God; it is manhood that has been carried into the very presence of the Most Holy, in the ascension of Him, who, being God, will never lay it aside. The day shall come when what man is, as redeemed unto God, and made one with Christ, shall be manifested—when both the greatness of his fall and the glory of his restoration and elevation, through the precious blood that was shed for him, shall be fully seen. We shall then learn the meaning of that word, which says, that our blessed Lord "was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil," when the elements of death and dissolution shall be extracted from the creation—into which they only entered through the apostasy of their one head and master upon earth, MAN; and as, in subjection to him, they fell, when he fell—so, in dependence upon him, shall they arise, in their measure, to partake of his blessedness. Judgment is not only the condemnation of the oppressor, but the deliverance of the oppressed. The "new song" of those "redeemed unto God and to the Lamb" has a chorus of glorious and jubilant rejoicing from every creature delivered "from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," in which, according to its measure and degree of blessing, every work of his hand shall bear its part; and though the imagery be poetical, yet the reality is sure, which is set before us in the beautiful prophecy of Psalm xcvi.:—"The sea (*shall*) roar and the fulness thereof; the world and they that dwell therein; the floods (*shall*) clap their hands; the hills (*shall*) be joyful together before the Lord, when he cometh to judge the earth;" for "with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity." No one will for a moment, we trust, suppose

that we are here assuming, either by assertion or inference, an immortality for the irrational creation—we are simply saying, that as at the fall of man the creation fell with him, so when the “manifestation of the sons of God” takes place, it will be partaken, in the measure of which it is capable, of the “glorious liberty” unto which he enters.

Man, then, is the highest work of God, and it is with him, our brother, and not with inanimate nature, that, as God’s servants, we have to do. It is amongst men that our work lies ; it is for men, that they, through us, may be blessed, that we have received of God what we possess ; it is from men, and through men, as God’s instruments, that we, in turn, must look to receive our good. Where they most abound—where they most need our help, is the sphere wherein God’s good gifts to us are most to be exercised ; and whilst there are places fitted for the feeble as well as the active, crowded cities and extensive towns are the true field for large hearts and Christian energy, wherein to fulfil God’s holy will of mercy in the communication of blessing to our brother.

There is, no doubt, a charm in rural life ; there are sweet voices in the sunny skies—a language in every flower of the field and forest tree, which breed, in their turn, lowly thoughts of peace and high resolves. It is very good for all, from time to time, to step back from the crowd that struggles on in wild commotion, looking for honours, or wealth, or bread, that they may hold quiet communings with their own minds, and reckon with their hearts and consciences ; but to desire this always is not philosophy, is not Christian philanthropy, but selfishness. We are sent into the world, not to please ourselves, but help our brethren—not to foster to a delicate growth, for our own amusement, thoughts and feelings which, whilst they gratify us, are not profitable to those around ; but to school them into the patient endurance of all that is wrong towards ourselves, and bold resistance of all that is hurtful and oppressive to others. It is where men most congregate together that the worst phases of the human heart come into manifestation, and it is therefore there where the work of God is most to be done and is most needed. Christian benevolence must know no selfishness, and the distinction between a sentiment and a principle must be learned by every one who would faithfully fulfil his place in the world as the steward of the Lord. Where God is most opposed, there must his honour be most upheld ; and none so much need the life-giving and blessed words of the Gospel as those who have been bred and born where vice is most rampant—where all that is repulsive and distressing

combine to render the task of him who shall bring them the blessing one of continual and unwearied self-denial.

We have made a digression, and we fear a long one, but one which we think not altogether foreign to the subject of this paper—for the attempt to revive the past is one of the characteristics of the day, and it is of the characteristics of the day that we speak; an attempt arising in a great measure from a just estimate of the evils that exist, though not accompanied with a correct perception of the method of ameliorating them. An unintelligent veneration for antiquity is the extreme of a contemptuous disregard of it; and the fruit of the one—superstition, is nearly as baneful as the fruit of the other—scepticism. It is good, therefore, to bring facts to bear upon the poetical dreamings of the day. If they consist together, truth will have gained a graceful garment; if they do not, the garment must be laid aside, however beautiful may be its adorning. To speak in plain language—for these troublous times we need men of action, who will not live in thought amongst the dead, but throw themselves amongst the masses of the living, and use the strength and talent which God may have given them in the vigorous effort of rightly directing those who are misguided, and helping those who are necessitous, whether in body or mind.

The *past* never can come back: it is useless, with the experience of the nineteenth, to attempt the revival of the spirit or usages of the third and thirteenth centuries; nor is it wise to mourn for this, for—we speak it with reverence—it is doubtless the purpose of God that it should be so. The history of man, as seen up to the present, is, we have already remarked, a progressive advance—a continual development of all that constitutes his being: he has touched a point from which he cannot recede; he has attained an age which forbids him to become young. The man may, in the time when cares, and sorrows, and the business of life have given him thoughts and feelings which in his boyhood he never dreamed of, look back with affection to the days of his youth, but he cannot unmake himself—he cannot divest himself of the experience which, according to the purpose of God, and that he may be wise towards God, he has acquired—he never can again become the unknowing child he once was. Neither can this generation, whatever may be the reverential thoughts and feelings which are due to the past, *unlearn* the knowledge it has acquired, and throw itself back into the unspiritualized condition of the ages that are gone. He who purposed that the boy should become a man, and gives to man strength and ability for the work of

manhood, has also given the times and their work unto the world. Cares and sorrows, commotions and tossings of spirit, are one condition of manhood, and wisdom comes as their fruit to dignify old age; and it must be expected that the day, wherein the world touches the verge of the duration allotted to her in this dispensation, should be one of disturbance and distraction, as well as of much knowledge. Would that we could pursue the analogy, and say, that as it ought to be, so it is, and that the wisdom which should be the fruit of all her knowledge is the distinctive characteristic of her advancing age! Back, however, man will never go. Progression is the attribute of moral as well as of natural life—onwards, towards the future, he is continually pressing, and even accumulating, as he proceeds, fresh resources and acquirements to help him in the prosecution of good or evil, till he arrives at the perfection of the one, as far as it may be attained here, or that consummation of the other which shall be the closing up of all apostasies from God. The Reformation has effected a moral revolution, the consequences of which can never be undone; and we ought to bear this in mind. And here the question is, not whether that great event was, on the part of those who wrought it, right or wrong: we, for ourselves, believe that it was altogether unavoidable, and that all the evil which is charged upon it by the religious sentimentality of the day is clearly attributable to that which caused it—the deep corruption, both in doctrine and practice, of the Roman Catholic Church. The question is, not whether it was right to do that which cannot now be undone, but what our duty is in the condition of things which it has induced? It is morally impossible to substitute the spirit, the usage, the forms of thought and feeling of antiquity, for those which the Reformation has engendered; and all that can be done to any good effect is to become the masters of the advancing movement and direct it rightly.

The Roman Catholic writers are now defending the Popish corruptions of the Church of Christ (denying, of course, that they are corruptions), upon the principle that development is an attribute of the life which is given to her; and that the forms and observances of the middle ages and of the present are the opening to maturity of those seeds of truth sown and germinating in the patristic. That development is an attribute of spiritual life we firmly believe—that any such development has been manifested in the cumbrous and spirit-stifling services and ceremonies of the Romish Church we as firmly deny: and it is very clear to us that the Reformation,

in breaking through the narrow and un-Catholic barriers with which that portion of the Church had surrounded herself, has opened a way for the advancement of the Church Catholic to the goal that is set before her, to the development of every spiritual power and capacity that has been given to her; which otherwise, humanly speaking, never would have been afforded. The looking back, therefore, to the fathers, to the middle ages, even to the Reformation, as yielding the only light or principles that can aid us in the present, is clearly to betray a misunderstanding of our true position, which requires the combination and right adjustment of all that has been excellent in the times that are gone and the systems that are decayed, rather than the idolatry of any particular portion of them. The exigencies of this age are of a nature that they cannot otherwise be met. There are realities on every side of us which demand action, and not speculation—the watchfulness of one awake to every circumstance that is passing around, and not the visionary dreamings of one who longs for the past and mourns for its departure, however poetically. These realities are too evident to be mistaken; they are too solemn and important in their character to be lightly passed by; they are affecting the dearest interests of every man, and if we heed them not now, they will one day force themselves upon our attention in forms and ways that may not be resisted—with a trumpet tongue that shall awake the deepest sleeper, and a hand whose iron force none can withstand.

There is a word of great significance and of frequent occurrence in the mouths of men, and that is *Catholicity*. It is, indeed, *the word* of the age. Its use expresses universally a conviction and a desire: the *conviction* is one of suffering, arising from disunion—the *desire* is for unity. When men or nations lose faith in God they lose confidence in each other; and as it cannot be denied that the nations of Christendom have, as nations, abated from, if not rejected, the ancient forms of faith wherein their fathers nationally acknowledged God; so it is not to be wondered at that, with every appearance of peaceful intention, there should be little real confidence. Yet, in the midst of an evil which pervades not only nations, but every class of men in them, “brotherhood” is the word that is adopted. The political journals of the day speak of the intercourse of nations and of opposing classes as fraternization. Every public speaker is eloquent in the deprecation of divided interests. Even the banners of the village club tell you, in golden letters, that “union is strength.” Yet, with all this, in everything that is good disunion is continually on the increase.

Men are quite aware of this—the bad rejoice at it; the righteous deplore it, and unavailingly endeavour to prevent it—unavailingly, we say, for it is remarkable that every effort that is made for unity carries with it some fresh element of division; and with the most poignant sense and just appreciation of the evil, something is done to aggravate and increase it. Principles and truths, which are fitted to harmonize together, are brought into antagonism. With apparent equal honesty of motive, and whilst professing to have one end, the glory of God, in view, men depart from the same house which has hitherto held them together, diverge from each other, and *practically* advocate separation as a good, whilst they agree in deploring it as an evil. This is a condition into which the better classes of men are fast coming in every direction, and it is as heartbreaking as it is hopeless.

Words, however, which become of universal adoption have even their peculiar significance. They are sure to indicate some prevailing disposition characteristic of the times in which they are used. And the word to which we have alluded is an instance; for—whilst there is little real catholicity in that which is good, though there is a great yearning after it, and a great perception of the want of it—there is a *catholicity* in evil (if the expression may be allowed), foreboding direful calamity whenever it shall ripen into action. A community of thought, a moral and political freemasonry, is binding men together throughout Christendom into a powerful brotherhood; whilst they love not each other, they are linked by the conviction that they are enduring the same wrongs and grievances, are the victims of the same tyranny and oppression, and are making themselves ready to adopt the same means for their redress. Nationality, which held men apart from one another, has been, from a variety of causes, in a great measure destroyed. The peace which we have so long enjoyed has facilitated the intercourse of different nations, and destroyed or weakened the many prejudices which held us back from others. We have taken advantage of the opportunities afforded us with the energy that belongs to our character, and have acquainted ourselves with all that is thought and done in the nations around us: whether we have been greatly profited is a problem difficult to solve. England has much to communicate which it is for the world's blessing to know. God has vouchsafed to her a knowledge of divine truth, and given to her facilities for its propagation, which are not elsewhere possessed; and it may be that her present position is a part of the purpose of God, that she may be ready, as his instrument, to

carry forth the knowledge of his will throughout the earth. England has had, however, also much to learn in the way of evil, which her restless neighbour has been too ready and too anxious to teach her, and which she has been too ready to receive. The French, on the other hand, are in a position which has never been occupied by any other people: they have cast off their faith in God to a greater extent than was ever known in Christendom; they have passed through an experience of the nature and terrible consequences of infidelity, which none beside them have ever known, and yet retain it to be a scourge for others; they have attained a fearful eminence in the knowledge of vicious and evil principles unprecedented, and have become skilful in the successful propagation of their soul-destroying theories. The French revolution, in its effects, is not finished. If the Reformation, in its righteous protest against error, effected a moral revolution of one kind, this terrible event, in its crusade against all that was good, has taught men to think and act in forms of evil which were never before known. It has instilled an energy of vicious purpose, which, under subtle pretences, sends forth its missionaries into every part of the earth, to inoculate all classes with its baneful doctrines. Many have successfully resisted them; but many more, to whom, from the position which they themselves occupy, these doctrines have proved acceptable, have received them; and whilst Italy, Germany, Spain, Portugal, and Belgium are rife with them, there is not a spot in this once quiet land which does not now possess, in the disciples of Chartism, or some other political *ism*, members of the band, who, though they be not known to their brethren, have a catholicity of evil principle, which, whenever the time for it arrives, shall unite them in one terrible array of hostility against all that is good and sacred. England, alas! has gained nothing, in a moral point of view, in her intercourse with France, but that "knowledge of evil which is not wisdom." There is, moreover, this melancholy fact before our eyes, that exactly in the inverse ratio as those who are thus silently binding together for evil are daily adding to their numbers and their strength, they who alone can oppose them are separating from each other and becoming powerless through division.

One thing which should be deeply pondered over is, that many of the alleged grievances of the people, and especially of the poorer classes, have a reality of existence. They may be unjustly pleaded, and for an unrighteous end; they may be made, as they are by designing men, the ready means of stirring up disaffection and rebellion, wherein none would be

gainers but those who, having risen by the advocacy of the grievances, would be the first to increase them—for of all men the political adventurer is the most hypocritical and callous-hearted; but still they do exist to an extent painful to contemplate. The reports of the Poor Law Commissioners, the discussion of the factory question and the statistical information brought forward in that discussion, the daily police reports, the experience of every active clergyman, the class of beggars daily at our doors, with every allowance for the amount of imposition practised—all show a mass of suffering totally unprecedented, the remedy for which seems utterly beyond the reach of legislative enactment. We have reason to be thankful to God for the un murmuring patience with which this suffering has been borne; and all who are called upon to deal with the poor and labouring man have need to watch over themselves, lest, in the selfishness of their own pursuits and the requirements of their own interests, they forget his privations and his endurance, and exasperate him, by a hard-hearted refusal to sympathize with his wrongs, into a ruinous attempt to redress them for himself. It is not our place to quarrel with measures which have become the law of the land; nor our wish to underrate the difficulties of those who have, amidst so many conflicting interests, to legislate so, that whilst one class is provided for, another be not wronged; but we do wish that, in the balance and adjustment of the scinterests, *man*, as *man*, were more considered, and *money* less—that in listening to the landlord and the manufacturer, the labourer were not so often forgotten. We know it will be answered that the interest of the latter is comprehended in that of the former, and that he is considered when whatever affects his master is taken into account; but still it must be evident that, by the change which the Reform Bill has wrought—an effect never contemplated—money, and not men, is represented, and that a great proportion of the members being manufacturers (who, of necessity, use up their labourers as they use up their machinery—who, from the nature of the system by which they make their wealth, as we too well know, create pauperism wherever they go, and become callous to the amount of suffering which is daily before their eyes), all matters affecting the poor become, in their public discussion, rather matters of arithmetical statistics than of moral duty and obligation. There is a struggle going on throughout the land, the issue of which, in one way, is not doubtful, though what its ultimate effects may be none can tell. It is one between the manufacturers and the landlords, grounded really on considerations of pure sel-

fishness on both sides, wherein the latter, perhaps, have *right* as an accident, if you will, and the former mere mercenary interest, to recommend respectively their claims. It may be, and doubtless is, that this question is one affecting, more or less, all who dwell in the land; but whilst many references are made in its discussion to the interests of others, and especially of the poor, we must be pardoned if we take the liberty of doubting the amount of patriotism which the manufacturers, especially in their appeals to the country, claim to possess, as impellent motives in the conflict. The poor man is continually told that for *his* benefit this strife is carried on, and that in its successful termination *he* is the individual who will most be benefitted; *his* difficulties and privations are dwelt on with pathos by the men who have made their wealth through their endurance. The distressed condition of the manufacturing population, however, receives a fearful comment when accompanied by professions of sympathy for their condition in the princely sums which their masters eagerly contribute to a League whose sole object is not the benefit of the country, but the private advancement of a class in the downfall of their brethren. It is truly melancholy to think that men will either delude themselves or others thus. We can only test professions and promises which have respect to the future by the experience of the past; and this we know, from a residence amongst the classes we speak of, and personal observation, that in the midst of all the sufferings of the manufacturing poor, the same fortunes continue to be made; that whilst advantage is taken of every fluctuation of the market to abate their wages, they are never, in a favourable crisis, restored or increased; and that the master, in reluctance to lessen his own gains, mostly throws the burden of suffering, from a depression of trade, upon the workmen. The labourer is urged to contend against the farmer because his employer is grieved, as he says, to see him pay so much for his loaf, and desirous that he should have it at a cheaper rate; whilst with the farmer a different tone is taken—he is told that his Corn Law must be repealed, that the labourers' loaf being cheaper, the master may, by the reduction of his wages, be able successfully to carry his goods to a foreign market—and the issue of this duplex, if not deceitful dealing, will be, what the workman little expects, the lowering of his hire in a ratio of loss far greater than the benefit gained. A charge is brought against the landlords, that they are selfishly desirous of maintaining a monopoly, the evils of which are depicted with great talent and ability; but this charge is brought with singular inconsistency by a class

of men whose avowed object in their cry for cheap bread is, that they may create a monster monopoly for themselves, carry their goods into every market of the world, and outsell every foreign merchant who shall dare to compete with them in his own land. In all this contest—and this is what here we have now to do with—the poor are really but little considered—certainly more by those who have been born and bred among them, and know that it is the tenure by which land is held that the labourer should live out of its produce, than by those who class human labour in the same category with machinery, and regard the wear and tear which their system creates in the one, as indifferently as in the other. The antagonism between the workmen and their masters in manufacturing districts is very frightful, and is another index to the extent of suffering that exists. It is a continual calculation, on the one hand, of the greatest amount of labour that can be procured at the least possible remuneration; it is a continual determination, on the other, in the constant expectation of oppression, to give no more than can be enforced. The combinations that exist of masters against workmen, of workmen against masters—the desperate struggles that labouring poverty makes with enormous wealth, to find itself over-matched and beaten into a worse condition than before—all show, that if manufactures, to the extent to which they are now carried, be the source of riches to some, they are the ever-springing fountain of untold misery and suffering to thousands. Can it be helped? Alas! no. But let not the poor man be mocked in his misery, and be told by the well-fed and comfortable theorist he has no grievance to complain of—let him not be deluded with promises that can never be realized—nor be tortured by the appliance of iron rules and the self-complacent schoolings of men who have never known what it is to hear, day by day, the wailing cry of those who are dependent upon them for bread which they cannot give. To be able to work—to be willing to work—and yet forced to be idle; to stand in the midst of luxury and plenty without a morsel to satisfy the cravings of hunger; to see those whom we love (and the poor man is no brute that he should not love his kind) wasting with famine, and no resource left open; to have no appeal, save to a hard law, wherein there is no mercy, administered by men hardened in its working—this is the condition of thousands in this land, and no wonder if the consequence some day be a terrible outbreak of passions long pent up—a manifestation of those evil principles which are being so largely sown amongst them, and which, in their distressed condition, find so ready a

soil for growth. Political economists bring their theories and statistics into play when considering the condition of the labouring classes, and fancy they settle the matter; but they are met and answered by a simple arithmetic too powerful to be overcome. "There is bread in the land for all, you say. We are starving; give it us. There is over-production. We are naked; let us be clothed. We can and we will work, that we may eat and that we may be warm; give us work. So many loaves for so many mouths, so many coats for so many backs, and we offer you, in fair compensation, the labour of so many strong arms." The demand is a just one—the offer is fair—but such is the fearful pass to which we have come, that no legislative skill or device can suggest the means by which they may be complied with and accepted.

We have in these remarks spoken of the contest between the landlords and the manufacturers, to instance, by an example familiar to all, the divided condition of classes, and the selfish nature of the struggle that is going on between opposing interests. We have alluded to the League, because of the duplicity of its plea of pity for the poor. We know that noble exceptions to the observations which we have made do exist; the more noble, that they have been found superior to the debasing effects of a system which, in its all-absorbing grasping after wealth, requires much ability and gives much knowledge, but does not and cannot naturally improve the heart.

In this age, then, when intellect is rampant; when all that is spiritual is coming into manifestation in ways and forms hitherto unthought of; when practical science has achieved its greatest triumphs, and steam, by its mighty agency—one distinctive feature of the times—is working wonders and changes, whose consequences none can fully predicate; when there is a catholicity of evil uniting men, in spite of national differences, into one great confederacy; when suffering is unprecedented in amount—it is manifest that we have come to a pass hitherto unknown, whose future is big with great events not far distant in their revelation. All are asking, what can be done? Some look to the past, seeking to revive, with what hope of success we have already seen, the spirit and the practice of one or other of the ages that have gone. Some assert that the very storms that darken the whole moral atmosphere will purge the elements of their diseased condition, and out of disorder bring forth peace and quiet. Every one has his nostrum; many political experiments have been tried and have failed; and the most are waiting in anxious expectation to see in what the rapid progression of events will end. If help is to be looked

for anywhere, it must be in the Church—she alone has within her the strength and the ability which are needed for the crisis; and in proportion as her servants use them will the exigencies of the times be met; and it is because that it becomes the clergy, more than any others, to know the signs of the times, that we have ventured to set down here some few of their characteristics.

It is clear, that in the present convulsed condition of society, the Church must be affected: that she is threatened from without and within is notorious; her adversaries are implacable, and her children are, in many instances, unfaithful. But it has been remarked, that of all men the clergy seem least alive to the dangers that hang over them, as a body; that the house which they inhabit is ready to fall to pieces, and though all without observe it, they continue to slumber at their ease within. We do not believe this to the extent asserted. Many causes have contributed to arouse the clergy to a right understanding of their position; and whilst there are, no doubt, and always will be in this dispensation, unfaithful and unwise stewards of God's word, there are many conscientiously striving to discharge their duty with the strength and grace vouchsafed to them; and these generally are not unaware of the frail nature of their hold on the affections of the people, so far as it may be reckoned upon from causes independent of personal attachment. The hope of those, however, who desire to see the downfall of the Church, whether they be Dissenter or Infidel, is based upon a false foundation. They trust that if the Church be broken up, as a visible unity, their several particular views of what is most excellent might be reduced to practice, and come into operation. When that day comes, if it is to come, there will be little place for anything save anarchy—little room for testing merits of particular theories; since all classes will be blended together in one common ruin, and personal preservation will be the chiefest thought in the minds of men. If the Church fall—and the Church of England is one portion of that Church in the land—the whole system, politic and social, must fall with it; for the existence of the Church in the world is the only guarantee for the safety and well-being of society. It is not a question of what, in any nation, shall be the form of discipline which the Church administers, nor what the manner of sustenance afforded to her ministers, though these be vital questions; but a *truth*, as set before us in God's holy word, and a *fact*, as proved in the experience of every land, that without the Church the body politic and social cannot exist together. The faithful are the salt of the earth—

the Church is the light of the world. By faith, nationally professed, are the institutions of a State sanctified and rendered effective; by the light of God's truth issuing from his sanctuary are the dark places of the earth enlightened—the rules of moral right and wrong defined and firmly established. There is not a law of righteousness, there is not a principle of good and healthful policy, there is not a theory of just government and true obedience, that is not traceable to the revelations of divine truth, under the old or new dispensation. That men have forgotten this makes nothing against the fact. As salt, entering into the constitution of a body, preserves it from decay so long as it remains therein, so faith preserves the social system, which has no other element that can hold it together. What the sea would become were its saline properties destroyed, a mass of corruption generating death, that will any people become who discard the Church from their bosom, and pluck from their heart the root of that faith which their fathers planted, confessed unto the death, and nourished with their blood. This they have yet to learn who desire the destruction of the Church, as a visible unity, from this land. Insensate attacks are rife against all ecclesiastical establishments, and, as a matter of course, against that form of them existing in this country. The Scottish seceders have, after a most unchristian fashion, sent their delegates amongst us, to stir up the discontented and turbulent of every party to a crusade against the Mother who bare and nurtured us, and have made it manifest, by the intolerance of their sentiments, how nearly the bigotry of Popery and the spiritual arrogancy of Dissent are allied. But as long as God's purpose requires that the Church should exist upon earth, as long as that purpose requires it to exist in this land in the form which it has borne, they will not be permitted to succeed—when it has done its work, then, and not till then, they may be successful; and nothing will remain but the one fearful lesson to be learned in the dissolution and disruption of all order and every social bond, how that without the Church the earth has lost its salt.

Our Lord rebuked the Pharisees because they did not know the signs of the times. The commendation in Scripture is of that faithful and wise steward who, "when his Lord comes, is found feeding his household with meat in due season." It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that, in order to avoid this rebuke and to receive this commendation, we both know the season, and to the meat proper to it; and we have endeavoured, in the foregoing remarks, to point out popularly some few of the characteristics which mark the times in which we live, that our

brethren may be assisted in the discovery. There may be some, but we think the number will be few, who will answer to such observations, that they savour somewhat of the visionary, and the more particularly in this, that they, by inference, lead to the conclusion that this dispensation is near its close. If, however, the suggestion, judging from the things around us, that it may be so, be visionary, then is every thinking man of the present day a visionary; for greatly as men differ in all other things, they agree in the one expectation of some great event, which, however diversely they may designate it, the most look forward to with undefined fear, and all with great anxiety; and we know of no events which the Church believes in and looks forward to, answering to this expectation, but those accompanying the consummation of the purposes of God in the dispensation that now is.

It cannot be concealed that peace and quietude are no longer elements of the pastor's office: peace, in one sense of the word, every faithful servant of the Lord will find in the faithful discharge of his duty; but it is the peace which He giveth, and, as such, consists with the suffering of the "*tribulation* that is in the world." As that tribulation increases in extent and intensity, it will leave none unscathed—least of all, the clergy. Mixed up as they are, by the very nature of their duties, with all that is passing around, they cannot, if they would, become indifferent to it; and even those who will not bear the suffering for their Master's sake will be made to taste of the trouble that is in all men's minds, and the disorder that is on all men's fortunes, from their very position in society, as ministers of a Church which, whilst she has been, in difficult times, a blessing (as always) to men, has also been the object of wicked attacks and bitter enmity. In cities and large towns the clergy have long since learned this. The stormy elements of contention, both theological and political, have found and stricken them in their places, which are no longer places of quiet and refuge; and the most retiring have been forced forward, in the defence of God's truth and all right principle, to take positions which they do not naturally desire—to occupy a prominence which is foreign to their wishes. So intimately are the ramifications of conflicting interests interwoven, that no one can be righteously upheld without seeming wrong or displacement of another. Thus the care for the poor and defenceless, which naturally and properly belongs to the pastor's office, sometimes seems to compel a disregard of the difficulties and rights of the rich; teaching of those who are in authority the duties that properly belong to their station, would seem to infer the coun-

tenance of disorder and disobedience on the part of those who are subordinate. Moreover, theological truth, and political principles and positions, from the very constitution of society, are so blended together, that it is next to impossible to maintain the one without appearing unduly to meddle with the other. Hence the clergy in large towns have a very arduous and difficult task before them, in the fulfilling of which they must, as matter in course, expect to meet with obloquy and evil judgment from the many, and be content with the consciousness of rectitude which it might please God to vouchsafe to them, and the Christian love of the few whom it may please him also to bless through their labours. And that which has happened in large towns is fast arriving in the hitherto quiet retirement of country parishes. The restless spirit which is abroad to break up and destroy, engendered by the fierce revolutionary movements and the infidel speculations of the last half century, is walking through the length and breadth of the land; and there soon will be no corner that has not owned his baneful presence. The life of a country clergyman, hitherto suggesting in its contemplation thoughts of contentment and peaceful dignity, in such an aspect exists no more. Every village has its contemnners of order—its superficial but skilful debater against Church and State—its little political coterie, inoculated with the virus of the day, and sufficiently infectious to spread a moral disease around. The press and the beer-shop—the Chartist and the Socialist—the political experiments of heartless and designing men, whereby the poor were to gain so much, but whereby they have received so little, save in the increase of their grievances, have each done their work. And the reverent peasant of former days, who thought it a sin to doubt the truth which his pastor taught, and was blessed and prospered in his Christian simplicity, is a character of rare occurrence—a decaying land-mark, as it were, to show what were the ancient boundaries of rural faith and conduct, and how far the mad spirit of the day has broken through and overstepped them. Quiet for the pastor is no more, and indolence, its next door neighbour, almost impossible; and where there is no real love of God, no real understanding of the nature of office, no longing for the fulfilment of God's blessed purposes, and the salvation of those committed to his charge—where there is only love of ease, or care for gain, the pastor's place and position will be intolerable—an accumulation of trouble upon trouble, without the blessedness of the consolation that the Lord has promised to the faithful and burthen-bearing servants of his household.

ART. VI.—*The Factory System*. By W. COOKE TAYLOR, LL.D. London: How.

2. *Free Trade, with reference to its Effects upon the Operative Classes*. Briefly considered by HUMANITAS. Dedicated, by permission, to the Society for the Protection of Agriculture. London: Painter. 1844.

3. *The Labourer's Friend*. June, 1844.

A POLITICIAN, who indulges in prophecy, is looked upon as unsafe; and the statesman, who governs by experience alone, is considered as incapable of directing the progress of an advancing people, and of meeting emergencies of a character to which past history can supply no analogy. For our own parts, though we do not undervalue political foresight, we are inclined to agree with Burke, that "to us poor, weak, incapable mortals, the only safe rule of conduct is experience;" and we may add, that principle best guides its application. At present, we shall not deal in vaticinations—retrospects are more safe, more real, and more useful; and if we can rise up from the view we mean to take with a clear sense that the political horizon has become brighter and steadier, our glance backwards may not only render us more satisfied with our present condition, but even thankful for it, and yet without at all slackening our efforts for improvement. We go no further back than 1841, nor shall we do more than briefly notice the chief incidents of that and the two succeeding years.

The Whig Government having held office without power—one principle they had, that of self-preservation—unhumiliated by defeat, weakly sustained by a divided party, shackled in their attempts at legislation—now leaning for support on the Great Conservative Opposition, but more frequently trusting to the votes of that Radical section to which they succumbed—having embarrassed the country by a deficit of upwards of seven millions, and involved it in two wars, commenced without precaution and spun out by indecision—still, with desperate tenacity, clung to Downing-street. Their plan was bold: in legislation to pass every measure their opponents sanctioned, and in council to leave every important question an open one, and so hold together, by the charm of office, a disunited Cabinet. Unmoved by the taunts of their adversaries—

“For sufferance was the badge of all their tribe”—

they exercised, in internal concerns, a rule almost imbecile, and in foreign affairs a power meddling and mischievous. Beaten on their Irish Registration Bill, they brought forward their Budget;

beaten, after five nights' fighting, by a majority of thirty-six on that, they came down quietly to the house to propose the usual sugar duties, without giving the least intimation of their intention to resign! They had, in fact, ingeniously determined "in the last conjuncture of distress, in their dire emergency of difficulty and despair," as a piece of tactics, to remain in office until they had inflamed the country by the delusive cry of cheap bread. But they trusted too much to the forbearance of the House of Commons and of the people of England—on the 27th of May the decisive motion of "want of confidence" was brought forward.

Those who are accustomed only to the ordinary meetings of the Lower House—to see members lounging at full length on the benches, or congregating about the bar, rendering necessary the continual reprimand of the Speaker—would be surprised at the stillness, the attention, and the eagerness which awaited the leader of the Opposition, as he rose, with clear and harmonious voice, to move what the country knew to be a truism, and which even all non-official representatives acknowledged to be the fact. Had the Conservative party confidence in the Ministry? Had the Free-trade section confidence in men who avowed protection, but higgled only at the amount? Had the Universal-Suffrage, Vote-by-Ballot, Triennial-Parliament advocates confidence in men who held the finality of the Reform Bill? Had the O'Connell and Repeal party confidence in "base, bloody, and brutal" Whigs, who, through Lord Fortescue, had declared that to be a Repealer was a disqualification for office? A very brief experience was enough of Whiggism. The words of Lord Chatham might well have been applied to the Melbourne Ministry—"Confide in you? Oh no—you must pardon me: youth is the season for credulity—confidence is a plant of slow growth in an aged bosom;" and yet, on a division, the majority was but one!

The appeal to the country was not so dubious: despite official influence—despite the electioneering cry of cheap bread—a cry raised by an expiring party, who used their dying energy to serve their factious purposes—the Whigs met a disastrous defeat. The contempt of the people of England gave place to indignation, and, with accumulated scorn, the Melbourne Cabinet were driven from office, who thus were forced to bid

"A long farewell to all *their* greatness."

These matters of history are not to be forgotten; we have, with a hasty and dark dash, noticed the last days of Whig rule, and now pass on to that of their successors.

At the opening of the session of 1842 the political horizon was gloomy in the extreme. We had an embarrassed exchequer, a continually increasing national debt, severe depression in trade, and consequent acute distress in the manufacturing districts, and but an indifferent harvest. About the severest disaster that ever befell British troops threatened to make the plot which darkly covered our arms in Affghanistan extend to the erasure of our Indian empire; in China hostilities were dragging on their apparently interminable length; difficult questions had to be adjusted with our encroaching brethren in America; and in France we had to stifle and drown the insane war-cry of an excitable and mercurial people.

But the people of England had hope in their rulers, and her energies are mighty and buoyant when called forth by those in whom she trusts. The personal characters of the members of the new Cabinet stood high in the estimation of the country, when contrasted with those of their predecessors; and their political ability, their aptitude for business, and their industry, were confessedly great.

The name of the Duke of Wellington carried with it a *prestige* which almost assured us of success in our military operations; and the country looked to the comprehensive range of Sir Robert Peel's talents as capable of allaying the outcry for cheap food, without withdrawing a due support from agriculture; of imparting a new stimulus to trade, without detriment to interests which claimed protection; of checking joint-stock banking speculations, without depriving the honest trader of the means of obtaining an adequate amount of credit; and, finally, of retrieving the deficiencies of the revenue, without imposing new burdens on industry.

Worldly men expected these results, and they have been fulfilled amply, speedily, and well; we expected more—in Sir Robert Peel's words, we imagined that, "if he accepted office, it would be by walking in the open light, and in the direct paths of the Constitution" (see *Annual Register*, 1841, p. 192). We hoped for liberality in Church extension, as well in his ministerial as his private capacity—of his personal munificence we are bound to speak in terms of high praise; for the advancement of a national system of education; for at least an attempt to improve the physical and moral wants of the inhabitants of the manufacturing towns; for the removal of the most obnoxious details of the Poor Law; and finally, and above all, did we hope for a thorough and unwavering determination to maintain the United Church of England and Ireland, and not to hear even the faintest whisper of yielding, if expediency should suggest that there was an

"overpowering necessity." We regret to be obliged to state that some of these, our not unreasonable expectations, have been but imperfectly realized. But to proceed. In legislation, the session of 1842 has been unquestionably the most important since the passing of the Reform Bill. A glance at the statute-book would show the vastness and the number of the measures that have been made law; and, in truth, it was no light task to legislate for us then. We believe that it was of the most incalculable importance to the country to have a strong Ministry in office. An income-tax was so unpopular a measure, that a weak Government dared not, and one that had but a slight majority in the Commons, we fear, would not have proposed it; but the attenuated state of the national finances required a severe corrective, and the Government, Parliament, and the country deserve high commendation—the first for braving unpopularity in proposing, and the two latter for the contentment, nay the alacrity, with which they received the unpalatable remedy. For ourselves, we are of opinion, that with a little more regard to the proportions in which incomes are to be charged, making a fair difference between those which are obtained from trades and professions, and those which are for life, or derived from estates of inheritance, that an income-tax is as fair a one as can be levied. The debating and expository abilities of Sir Robert Peel were never more conspicuously displayed, nor more severely tested, than during this session. He had to induce one side of the house to believe in the extent of the concession he was making, and the other to confide in him that they would receive but little injury in making it.

It was a matter of no light moment to touch the then existing Corn Laws, and tamper with an interest in which three hundred millions of capital were embarked, and which, in a social point of view, affected materially the comfort, prosperity, and happiness of all classes, as well manufacturing as agricultural. Political opponents had predicted that a change of men was to bring no change of measures, and that the sliding-scale would be abandoned, or, if not abandoned, reduced to a very low mark indeed. But, as was prettily quoted by Lord Morpeth—

"Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum."

We do not mean incidentally to argue the justice of the Corn Laws, but we believe that, so far as the experience of two years goes, the law of 1842, and the scale of duty then established, have succeeded in causing a discontinuance of those gambling speculations which, under the old law, ruined merchants, worked injuriously to the farmer, and deranged the currency; have suc-

ceeded in lowering the price of bread; and have *secured*—*emphatically* we use the word *secured*—to the landowner and land-occupier a protection sufficient to prevent one cultivatable rood of ground from lying uncultivated: the reverse would be a result which no lover of his country could witness without bitter lamentation.

We may have the misfortune to differ from my Lord Brougham, but we are nevertheless of opinion, that the lot of the rural and farming population of England is happier and better than that of any class who are doomed in this country to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. They breathe the pure, and in general clear, air of heaven; they go forth to their labour until the evening—a labour healthful, and, if not excessive, conducive to longevity; and there is one especial element in their happiness—that they are immeasurably less exposed to the contaminations of social guilt than their fellow-citizens in the manufacturing towns. We do not say that the labourers of England are as well off as we should wish them to be—far otherwise; and most heartily do we bid God speed to the Labourers' Friend Society, or any other Society which has for its object the improvement of the condition of the labouring classes, more especially in the erection for them of comfortable dwellings; but let it be impressed on our minds that their improvement and the maintenance of agriculture are inseparably identified. Instead of mutual recriminations between the members of the Pro-Corn Law League and the Anti-Corn Law League, let there be exhibited a generous rivalry as to who shall best promote the comfort and happiness of the respective portions of their fellow-countrymen who are their dependents. We have heard many hard and uncharitable words—let us behold some good and kindly deeds, some actions that may palliate the misdeeds of the older association, and some that may give the *imprimatur* of excellence and utility to the new.

The Income-tax, Corn Law, and Tariff should be considered together. Of the last laborious piece of legislation we may observe, that the cheapness of provisions occasioned by it was a great boon to the poor, as well as to that large class who have but limited incomes, whilst already the revenue is beginning to recover the loss it sustained. We are aware that in Ireland the reduction of price in cattle and corn occasioned very great discontent, and pressed heavily on the poor cottier who, without capital, had "but his patch of oats and his pig to make his rent." From this cause Mr. O'Connell found many to join his Repeal agitation, but we believe that dissatisfaction has given way, and

that ever since the groundless dread of foreign cattle has subsided a remunerative price has been obtained for all kinds of agricultural produce.

But the business of the session stopped not with these three great measures. Important changes were made in the laws of Bankruptcy and Lunacy. A bill was brought in and passed for the prevention of bribery at elections—would that the measure were effectual!—the credit of which is mainly due to Mr. Roebuck and Lord John Russell. Literary men were not neglected—the Copyright Bill was passed; and although not a Government measure, the extension of the author's property in his work to the term of forty-two years is mainly due to Sir Robert Peel. It is gratifying also to be able to record that the efforts of benevolence and humanity were successful—Lord Ashley passed his bill for the prevention of women working in collieries; and in this instance a compassionate House of Commons only acted at the reflex of a unanimous public—we believe we may even include the owners of the coal-pits as approvers of the act.

Nor was Ireland overlooked. The law, as to those offences for which capital punishment could be inflicted, was assimilated to the law of England. It was a fact, that in Ireland sentence of death could be passed on a man convicted of killing a goat; and there are yet some important differences in the criminal laws of the two countries. In Ireland a man on his trial for high treason can only challenge twenty jurymen peremptorily—in England he can challenge thirty-five. In Ireland a prisoner on his trial for a felony not punishable with death cannot challenge peremptorily at all—in England he can to the number of twenty. We wonder some *soi-disant* Irish patriots have never mentioned these differences in countries where the common law is said to be the same. Two other very important measures were enacted, in the anxious hope that they would facilitate the development of the natural resources of the sister country—we mean the Drainage and Fishery Bills; but neither, we fear, have effected much good. Let us hope they will hereafter be of benefit.

We shall not enter into any detail of the hundred other bills that were passed. We have shown enough to justify us in stating that, in point of practical legislation, the first session of the present Parliament, directed by a Conservative Government, presented a gratifying contrast, when compared with the amount and quality of legislation of their immediate predecessors during their whole tenure of office. The country knew that in the

councils of the nation vigour and decision were substituted for imbecility and rashness.

Ere the year closed, our foreign affairs wore a brighter colour. We had ratified a treaty with America ; were on good terms with the Government of France ; had redeemed the lustre of our arms in Affghanistan ; and concluded a most advantageous peace with China. The words of the Duke of Wellington were fulfilled, that this country should never wage "a little war."

We cannot close our review of the year without reluctantly mentioning one very distressing circumstance, which obliges us to notice only the general, and not the universal, success of the Administration, though the crime be not chargeable to them : we mean the outbreak in the manufacturing districts. The mechanics in the north of England had for a long time exhibited great patience under severe distress, and it was most unhappy that they should have selected a period for their misguided attempts when there were indications of a revival in trade. The firmness displayed at the Home-office and by the local authorities, the alacrity with which troops were sent down, and the returning good sense of the people themselves, soon restored tranquillity, with but little effusion of blood. We gladly pass from the criminal excesses of our fellow-countrymen—men goaded by distress and hunger, and urged by enthusiast and dishonest Chartists, demagogues, and free-traders.

Without using the language of inflated praise or ill-natured detraction, we may wind up our brief notice of the year 1842 with the acknowledgment that the administration of the Government was entitled to the praise of boldness and honesty in meeting and overcoming national difficulties, both at home and abroad, and of judgment and discretion in the introduction of those measures which it adopted to accomplish its purposes. At the same time, it is not to be, nor ought it to be, concealed, that there was an inclination to push the principles, or the theory rather, of free-trade to their utmost safe application, and that the Premier avowed himself a free-trader, treating sugar and corn as exceptions from the general rule. At the time we deprecated further progress, and demanded something like fixed laws and fixed principles ! We do so still.

We now come to 1843. The monster difficulties which beset the Government in their first year of office having been removed, it might reasonably have been anticipated that the future task of governing the country would be easier, and that the machine, which had been skilfully set to rights, only required to be directed with care and diligence ; and certainly, look-

ing at the position of Ministers, it must be conceded that it was materially bettered. We have noticed the improved state of affairs abroad; and, in addition, we had ratified a commercial treaty with Russia. The right of visit remained unsettled with France and America alone, and seemed the only question likely to create embarrassment. At home, trade was reviving, though there was much distress amongst the operatives, and indeed generally. There had been a bountiful harvest; and the income-tax was more productive than the Premier had calculated upon; besides, money was to pour in from China. It remained to promote the internal well-being of the country—to propose and to carry measures for National Education and Church Extension, and to improve the spirit and administration of the law. And yet candour compels us to state that, contrasted with the preceding session, and compared with their Parliamentary power, the legislation of Ministers was a failure. Undoubtedly the course before them was not clear. A storm was brewing in Ireland—an insurrection broke out in Wales—a schism in the Church of Scotland caused the secession of a large portion of her ministry, of whose self-sacrifice there can be no doubt, though there is much of their prudence and propriety—and the historian probably will record that, on a dark winter's day, a maniac assassin lay in wait to take the Premier's life, and did unfortunately succeed in killing his secretary, an amiable and unoffending gentleman.

It would be tedious to analyze the business of the session: there was the usual amount of debating. Six goodly volumes of Hansard are filled with hon. members' speeches, dialogues, and questions; but the statute-book displays no very great specimens of senatorial wisdom. Let us not be misunderstood: we are very far from blaming Ministers for not passing six octavo volumes of statutes—on the contrary, we should wish the annual quantity abridged one-sixth. The preposterous number passed in the reign of George III. alone was *ten thousand*. Law-making has not decreased in proportion since: and the consequence is, that our code is so cumbrous, and our laws so numerous, as to be beyond the powers of any lawyer to digest, no matter how great his legal appetite—and be it observed, that every Englishman, as well as every lawyer, is expected to know the laws of his country. But what we do pronounce the failure of Ministers to consist in was this—introducing measures which they had not the perseverance or the power to carry. It is one thing never to devise a legislative measure, but another, and a Ministerially ignominious, thing to prepare one, and not have the power to make it law. When we recollect the great majo-

rity Ministers possessed in the Lower House, and the never-failing compliance of the Upper, we must condemn them, as we did their Whig predecessors, for abortive legislation.

The Factory Education Bill is too fresh on all men's memories to require more than a passing blow. It was abandoned. The County Courts Bill—capable of being made a most useful measure, though originally introduced by the Whigs—has been hung up for four sessions; we suppose it is now so old, and musty, and dry, that members are afraid to touch it: well, last session it was abandoned, and is now so antiquated that the House of Commons, we presume, does not like to part with its old friend until it dies of senectude. The sweeping Ecclesiastical Courts Bill, having been cut down and pared so much from its original shape that its parent, although he unnaturally assisted in the mutilation, could scarcely recognize his own offspring, was dropped. In fact, with the exception of what we may call matters of course, such as voting supplies, &c., the business of the session was exhausted in passing the Canada Corn Bill (against the wishes of Ministers' supporters, and which threatened to be their destruction), and the Irish Arms Bill, the obstruction to which was indecent and unparalleled, and which was finally modified, to use Sir Robert Peel's words, so as to meet the "objections of gentlemen opposite." Our predilections for the Ministry, and desire to give them our support, are sufficiently apparent; but praise is only valuable where it is deserved, and faults are not to be concealed, nor defects uncensured, where there is a resolve to be impartial. We should state that effect was given to the treaties for the suppression of the Slave-trade between Russia, Austria, Prussia, and Portugal, and the republics of Bolivia, Texas, Uruguay, Mexico, and Chile; and also to the regulations agreed upon for the guidance of the English and French fishermen. The benefit of the English Act, which limited the time for bringing actions for the recovery of benefices, was extended to Ireland—a very useful measure. We have now fairly summed up all the legislation for which Ministers are responsible, except Lord Aberdeen's Bill regulating, in Scotland, the mode of objection to a patron's presentee (which was too late to stop the tide of seceders), and Sir Robert Peel's Bill for Church Extension, on which we last year expressed our opinion at length. It is not to be denied that out of Parliament the Fabian policy of Ministers towards Ireland occasioned much dissatisfaction and distrust. As meeting after meeting was attended by Mr. O'Connell, and seditious speeches in quick succession were addressed to immense masses of ignorant people, urged to disaffection by topics the most exciting—love

of liberty and religion, hope of comfort and prosperity, hatred of oppression and tyranny—it was feared that a spirit of insubordination would be raised that could not be allayed without bloodshed. It was forcibly pointed out that the chief duty of the Executive was not fulfilled—the protection of the weaker portion of society—for undoubtedly the comparative handful of Protestants in the south and west of Ireland were within the power and grasp of the multitudes who flocked to the standard of Repeal. The greater his impunity, the louder were Mr. O'Connell's vaunts and the more daring his acts; step by step he seemed to advance unimpeded; the hall was built in which three hundred delegates were to meet to form the Constitution of Ireland. The universal cry which met men's ears was, "how long were Ministers to stand by with folded arms?" We did not dread a general outbreak—we had great confidence in the Duke of Wellington, and believed that every military precaution and safeguard would be taken. We trusted somewhat to the good sense and love of order of the Irish people, and to the strong front which, despite the disparity of numbers, the lovers of British connexion exhibited. On taking a calm review of the conduct of Ministers, and of the difficulties which beset them, we are of opinion that they have acted with prudence and firmness. They provided for the peace of the country by the number of their troops—they hoped that so absurd a demand as that for a repeal of the legislative union would not long be entertained: if they interfered prematurely, false liberality would have accused them of stifling free discussion; and it required a series of misdeeds to justify any appeal which had the prospect of success to the ordinary tribunals of justice. The causes of this monster agitation may be stated briefly—vanity, ambition, and it may be devoteeship, on the part of Mr. O'Connell; the desire of religious ascendancy and domination on that of the Roman Catholic priesthood; and the poverty, superstition, misery, and ignorance of the mass of the lower classes. A formidable combination of causes! and yet to which may be added a few subsidiary ones—the discontent occasioned by the great reduction of price in corn and cattle (to which we have already alluded), the stoppage of patronage at the castle enjoyed during the Normanby Viceroyalty, the unpopularity of the Poor Law,* and the severe distress, nearly amounting to famine, which almost pe-

* We happened to see the following absurd statement in a weekly paper:—"The chief objection of the Irish poor to entering the union workhouse is the compulsion of sitting on stools and forms, instead of the ground. This will hardly be believed, but it is a positive fact." It certainly will not be believed by any one who knows anything of Ireland.

riodically visited the west of Ireland. We willingly accord our praise to the exemplary patience with which the Irish peasant bears privation, cold, hunger, almost starvation. It is a touching, and yet a proud sight, to see men famishing and yet honest—pressed by the craving demand for food and yet refraining from outrage or robbery; but it is not to be wondered at that, if you promise a hungry man plenty to eat, he will listen to you—Mr. O'Connell did so. If you tell a pauperized people that a change of Government will make them rich, and if you enlist on your side their ministers of religion to give credence to the lie, such a people will hearken to you—Mr. O'Connell did so. If you appeal to a vain people by their nationality, they will be flattered into approving your appeal—Mr. O'Connell did so. If, with wonderful art, you cajole them, they will be so well pleased as to trust you—Mr. O'Connell did so. And if you, with the same Irish blood in your veins, with much ability and with great mob-eloquence, tell them tales of old religious feuds and political hates, and tell them that the same spirit and the same antipathy to everything Irish exists among the Saxon tyrants and oppressors of the present time, can it be wondered at, if you so pander to their passions, and excite them against others of a different race, class, and religion, that you will rouse them to madness, and, in their phrensied adoration, that they will become your tools?—Mr. O'Connell did all this.

Let there be a deep pity for the misled people of Ireland, but none for their leaders. There has been one extraordinary phenomenon connected with this agitation—the wonderful credulity and gullibility of the Irish. Over and over again Mr. O'Connell promised them their Parliament in College-green within six months; and yet lustres, almost decades, have passed away and there is no native Parliament, and no repeal of the union, and still his dupes trust him. Nor does he stoop to the ambiguity of the oracles of old—his *dico vos Hibernici* is plain, audacious, and unequivocal, and with all the improvidence of his countrymen he throws his lie naked before them. But the time for justice came—at length sufferance was exhausted—repression became necessary. After nine months of monster meetings and seditious harangues—

“*Matri longa novem tulerunt fastidia menses,*”

Mr. O'Connell and his most prominent repeal associates were indicted for a very high misdemeanour. We need not trace the successive steps of the “law's delay”—suffice it, that after a trial of great length they were convicted; neither shall we enumerate the expedients after conviction for postponing the sentence—suffice it, that they have been sentenced, with the exception of

the Rev. Mr. Tierney. Now we do not reprehend the conduct of their advocates in bringing every point of law raisable in their defence fairly before the court. Whosoever is attacked by law has a right to defend himself by every means which the law allows him, however remarkable may be the ingenious shifts and the legal *acumen* which his pecuniary resources, or the ability of his advocates, may procure him; but neither should the law deviate from its course and take some eccentric direction in any man's favour. The Government does not commence a State prosecution, neither should it suspend the sentence pronounced in that prosecution, for light reasons. The true way of solving the severity or mildness of the punishment inflicted on Mr. O'Connell is to consider the nature of the offence and the character and designs of the offenders.

Mr. Justice Burton, in passing sentence, observed :—

“It was a high misdemeanour, deserving a severe punishment; most culpable, most dangerous—dangerous to an extent, he might say, approaching, in its tendency, to civil war. It therefore, of necessity, led to severe and signal punishment. In awarding that punishment, the court felt that, however great the offence had been—however dangerous to the public welfare—however necessary the punishment to be inflicted—however convinced that the crime would have led, *and did lead*, to the convulsion of the public mind, the effects of which were yet to be seen—still the court felt that they were not to be led away either by feelings of indignation, or by any desire to inflict punishment for punishment sake, but that it behoved them to bring their minds free and unbiassed from external influences on the subject. A crime had been committed which called for exemplary punishment—punishment likely to prevent the same persons from committing the same offence again, and to deter others of the same views from the perpetration of similar acts.”

Guided by these reasons, and considering the character and stations of the prisoners—and we profess ourselves influenced by the same reasons as those expressed by Judge Burton—he proceeded to pass sentence on Mr. O'Connell:—One year's imprisonment, a fine of 2,000*l.*, and to find security in the amount of 10,000*l.* to keep the peace for seven years. It is said that the aged and venerable judge, with the weight of ninety years upon him, was affected even to tears. Let others of firmer and harsher moulds blame him, we cannot; his tears did not weaken his judgment, nor make him unmindful of his duty—“a very, very painful duty he felt it to be.” The intimate of Curran, he could recollect that orator's fiery declamation, and might, with pardonable, and we hope not unfounded charity, have believed that Mr. O'Connell had been betrayed by the warmth of his imagination, rather than the badness of his heart,

into criminal excesses—he recalled, too, that he was a member of the same profession as himself, and probably associated with him in causes when his own blood ran fiercer in his veins. The very magnitude of the offence, and the dislike which good men feel to being the instrument of punishment, made him feel pity for the offender. Undoubtedly his was a weakness, but it was not an unamiable one. Weighing the nature of the offence, we do not think the penalty too severe; the worst of it is, that the fine will be a tax on the people of Ireland, and not on Mr. O'Connell.

And now that the judges and jury have done their duty impartially and fearlessly, what is to be the conduct of Ministers? We have no doubt that Mr. O'Connell is sincere in his wish that peace may be preserved; no man is so lost as to desire the wanton and ineffective shedding of blood, and such obviously would be the result if a disorganized peasantry were to rebel against the Government. We also know that he is of a very advanced age, and that there is a possibility, but no more, of the sentence being reversed in the House of Lords; but yet, without his guarantee, and that given in the most binding shape, to abandon the agitation for repeal, or a well-accredited reason to believe that his health is materially affected, we see no reason for the remission of his punishment—a punishment which is not severe. Pending the prosecution he was allowed to hunt with his beagles; and after conviction he is lodged in luxurious apartments, has the range of a spacious garden, and holds levees. We have read few things more loathsome than the prayers and letters of the Roman Catholic priests for and concerning Mr. O'Connell. They turn the ordinances of their religion into ridicule and contempt, by the debased tone of sentimentalism they adopt, and the commonness and vulgarity with which they treat topics the most sacred. We shall now give our opinion on the policy of Ministers in regard to Ireland, which Sir Robert Peel declared he felt to be his chief difficulty. They have acted wisely in bringing political offenders to punishment, and patriotically in using the ordinary powers of the common law, rather than a Coercion Bill. We confess that, ere Parliament met, we had some dread that a legislative measure would be necessary, and feared that half the session would be consumed by *soi-disant* Whig and Liberal members obstructing, protesting, and dividing in every possible stage against whatever bill Ministers might think it necessary to introduce; nor were our apprehensions entirely dissipated until the verdict was found and the nine nights' debate had passed over. The general course of Ministerial Irish policy neither calls for much praise nor censure; it is more

of a negative than of a positive character, with the exception that they found a national system of education established, and they have continued it—nay, they have done more, they have this session increased the grant to the National Board, and have refused any aid to the Church Education Society. Surely when the lever of education is practically thrown by the national system into the hands of the Roman Catholic priesthood, it behoves a Conservative Government to be wary as to how they give direct support to Romanism. They have issued a commission of enquiry into the relationship existing between landlord and tenant, and we hope much from a thorough investigation into this subject, albeit it is a question of morals rather than of legislation; but the Ministry do right to direct their earnest attention to the sad social state of Ireland, and if they can point out to landlords the mode of improving the lot of their tenantry, applaud those who do so now, and stigmatize those who oppress—for there are bad men in every class, though we believe not many amongst the landlords of Ireland—they will do incalculable benefit. They have introduced a Registration Bill, but which we believe will be one of the dropped measures of this year. Some portions of it induce us to modify the opposition we were at first disposed to give it; but there are departures from the scheme of the Reform Bill, and we see no solid advantage to be gained for Ireland by the increase of an uneducated, and in many instances priest-ridden, and it may be landlord-ridden, constituency. Any measures that may tend to promote her natural resources shall have our strenuous advocacy; but any that may appear to us likely to increase the politico-religious animosity of the Irish people to each other—for already the evil is deep-seated and wide-spread—shall have our determined opposition. On the score of patronage, we are inclined neither to agree with our Irish Conservative friends nor with the Ministerial mode of dispensing it. We may observe, that it is a national Irish fault to rely too much on a patron and too little on themselves. It is certainly unwise to promote rats or nobodies, when there are men of consistency and reputation on the Ministerial side to be advanced—men too who have laboured and toiled, and perhaps endangered their lives, for the maintenance of Conservative principles, and who naturally feel aggrieved when the Government pass them by, and seek out less eminent individuals from the most moderate or the most renegade of their opponents. But a Government should have a fair discretionary power, and should not be questioned for every petty appointment—nor should they, by such paltry bribes as the places they can bestow, hope to conciliate the virulence of

their opponents, who despise the attempt; but their single object should be to select men of the greatest fitness and capability.

The rancour and evil feeling displayed by some of the Presbyterian ministers on their marriage question has been to us a subject of regret, believing them to labour under no hardship by the decision of the House of Lords; and all past marriages having been legalized by a retrospective act—a fact which they seem studiously to keep in the background, or out of sight altogether, when they become pathetic, and declamatory on wives being degraded to the class of concubines, and children to that of bastards—we were grieved that Christian men should allow their feelings to betray them into such unpardonable warmth and coarseness of language. The marriage question is so wide, and Ministers having done no more than legalize past mixed marriages, if we may so call them, we refrain from entering upon it cursorily.

We turn from the perplexing field of Irish politics with the observation that the conduct of the Ministry has been generally characterized with kindness and an anxious desire to promote the prosperity of Ireland—that they have exhibited firmness and prudence in maintaining the union between the countries, but that many of their other acts savour a little too much of conciliation than of strength; and with the advice that they govern her with a strong and firm hand, cementing and strengthening that union by their support of all those who are peaceable, loyal, and industrious subjects, who are attached to British connection, and who (in the words of the late address presented to her Majesty by Sir James Graham, on behalf of the Protestants and the non-repealers of Ireland, to the number of one hundred and sixty-seven thousand men) have declared their determination to “defend, in their several spheres and stations, the maintenance of the holy Scriptures, as the standard of Christian faith and morals, to preserve unshaken loyalty to the Queen, and defend the Protestant succession to the crown of these realms; and further, to firmly uphold with their lives and properties the integrity and security of the three kingdoms, as established by the Act of Union.” This we consider a very remarkable address, if signed, as we believe it to have been, with deliberation. Ministers may rest assured that the Protestant heart of Ireland is the mainstay of British connection, and the Protestant Church the best teacher of Christian morals; and that a heavy responsibility will rest on those who wound or weaken either.

We now come to the present year. With the exception of the convulsed state of Ireland, and the uncertainty of the re-

sult of the State trials, the session opened rather favourably for Ministers. Wales had been tranquillized; there was peace abroad, plenty at home; the harvest was good, trade had revived, the people were employed. As the legislation for the year has not concluded, we cannot, with propriety or fairness, pass sentence upon Ministers for more than a few isolated acts; and from a sense of justice to an absent man, we refrain from entering on the subject of Indian policy. When the reasons of the East India directors are before us, and the defence of Lord Ellenborough, we shall give our opinion upon the justice, the necessity, or the expediency of his recall. At present our means of judging are imperfect; but it cannot be denied that the course adopted by the directors was a censure upon and a blow to the Government.

The Factory Amendment Bill has attracted more attention than any Ministerial measure this session. It presented the curious exhibition of Ministers being twice defeated, and the third time carrying their measure by an immense majority of one hundred and thirty-eight, amongst whom were some who had previously voted for Lord Ashley's amendment. Curiously changeable are the divisions of a popular assembly. The division lists were a strong proof of Ministerial strength, but not well calculated to inspire confidence in the disinterested humanity of some hon. members. In expectation of a concise *precis* of the question at issue, and the general nature of factories, we took up "The Factory System," which, though rather hastily put together, contains some clever and some temperate observations. It is a careful endeavour to place the life of the factory operative in as favourable a position as possible; but we must state that the following passages did not inspire us with a high respect for either the author's logic or his candour. He observes—

"As any establishment, in which artizans, while working separately from each other, still work collectively towards one common work, is essentially a factory; it follows that the factory system cannot be in itself evil, unless all associated industry be likewise evil—a proposition which no man in his senses would venture to maintain."

This definition of a factory is obviously imperfect, and the deduction illogical. There may be one hundred or a thousand kinds, or every kind but one, of associated industry innocent, and yet the associated industry of factories—we do not state it is—may be evil. We are sufficiently "in our senses" to know that factory labour is not in itself an evil, though we should not prove it quite so inaccurately as Dr. Taylor does. Our next charge against him is more serious. He says—

"It would be a great blessing to the community if those who take

upon them to discuss the factory system, and to legislate respecting it, were compelled to visit the places which they pretend to describe, and to examine the system which they are so ambitious of regulating. The large factories, improperly called 'mills,' are described with most vehemence by those who have never been inside such an establishment in their lives, but who have conjectured its arrangements from viewing its outside; or, without visiting the localities where they are situated, have put together, in a strange jumble, all the notions which the vague term 'mill' has suggested to their minds. *It is already notorious that Lord Ashley, the leading patron of factory legislation, deems it a necessary qualification for his task to take a one-sided view of the entire matter,* and that he declined an offer to guide him through the principal spinning establishments as gratuitous and unnecessary. But Lord Ashley is not alone in this apparent determination to form a judgment without impartially examining evidence; in spite of Aristotle, there is a constant tendency to pass sentence on a conclusion, having adjourned the consideration of the premises."

We have already given a specimen of the author's own skill in the dialectic art. We could forgive his false reasoning, but it requires a greater exercise of Christian charity to pardon so grave, so deliberate a calumny on Lord Ashley's conduct, whose untiring benevolence and real principle would not injure the cause of humanity at the expense of truth or imperfect information. We could almost pity, but we must reprobate, the man who could deliberately write, "*Lord Ashley deems it a necessary qualification for his task to take a one-sided view of the entire matter.*" Who could have told Dr. Taylor so? Not the noble lord himself, for such a statement would at once destroy his efforts and deeply injure his character—and who else dares to attribute motives?

"Eheu

Quam facile in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam."

One is led to consider whether there may not be some "perturbing influence"—to use the author's favourite expression—to induce others to "take a one-sided view of the entire matter;" for instance, there may possibly exist some connection with the Anti-Corn Law League—the author best knows. We can assure him, that though, in the heat of debate, or in the columns of a low weekly newspaper, the injustice of the charge might pass despised or uncensured, we were grieved to see it made by an author of Dr. Taylor's reputation. As to the charge of Lord Ashley's having declined visiting the principal spinning establishments, we cannot authoritatively give it a contradiction, but it is rather inconsistent with the perfect knowledge which his lordship has always shown respecting the details of a factory.

As respects machinery, Dr. Taylor observes—

"It may be necessary to notice an objection to machinery, which will appear ludicrously absurd to those who are acquainted with factories, but which has some weight with those who have never paid any attention to the subject. We allude to the accidents which are supposed to be of common occurrence from machinery. Any one who reflected for a moment could not fail to discover, that an accident which destroyed life or limb must also derange the machinery; and however careless he might suppose master manufacturers to be of their workmen, he cannot imagine them to be equally regardless of their own property..... Experience has taught the mode of managing machines with safety; and, in fact, the accidents of collision from cabs, carriages, waggons, &c., in the city of London, far exceed in number, and in the amount of injury sustained, all the serious accidents which occur from machinery throughout England."

We happen to have before us Mr. Saunders' Report, ending July, 1843, and we find the following statement of the accidents which occurred in Halifax alone, in less than six months, from the 9th of January, 1843, to the 16th of May, since "experience has taught the mode of managing machines with safety:"—"January 9, the death of a girl, caught by an upright shaft; January 23, four children, under fourteen, had undergone amputation of the right fore arm within a month; March 15, two fatal accidents; May 16, a serious accident to a girl." Here were nine serious accidents, three of them fatal, within a space of about four months, in a single town. Truly the cause of humanity suffers as much from understating as from exaggerating the dangers to which our fellow-creatures are exposed. With Dr. Taylor, we do not regard mill-owners as demons nor as angels, but as men—many of them excellent, amiable, and philanthropic; many of them mere traders, who seek the utmost possible amount of gain at the least expenditure; who, we are ready to admit, would not willingly have children's legs, heads, and arms bruised and mangled, but who do not take sufficient precaution to save young and giddy children; in short, men who need supervision, and are all the better for being well looked after: and we rejoice to find very stringent provisions in the bill which has passed to guard against the dangers of machinery. Dr. Taylor does not object "to any of the great principles involved in the Factory Bill, but to the exclusiveness of their application." "The legislation which actually exists, or which is in progress of becoming law, *rests on the sound principle*, that it is the duty of Government to protect the weaker part of its subjects against the *possible abuse of power* by the strong." *The possible abuse!* Where are this man's feelings, heart, and sympathies? *The possible abuse!* If abuse were but possible, and not actual, severe, terrible, we should not, perhaps, even ask

the Legislature to interfere. But is it not proved, notorious, and existing? He goes on—

“Protection to the females employed in the *few industrial* branches open to woman’s labour is humane and equitable; but why should it be given in factories where the labour is light, the wages good, the precautions against immorality greater than in any other line of life, and the hours of labour *never protracted beyond the endurance of physical strength*, while it is withheld from the women harnessed to waggons in the coal-mine, from the sempstresses and milliners of London, and from those who work for the slopsellers of the Minories? This ought you to have done, and not to have left the other undone.”

Does the author forget that Lord Ashley, whom he tries to depreciate, is not exclusive in his humanity, and has succeeded in prohibiting women from being harnessed to waggons in a coal-mine? Is he so absorbed in his love for mill-owners as to forget this? And does he not know that there are many social evils which defy legislation, but that, by the blessing of God, wherever they are remediable, they shall be remedied? We are making a beginning to an end; and where is the regard for truth, that can hop lightly over those portions of the reports which do not suit his views, and crowd together those which do, and which could feel easy in writing that the “hours of labour are never protracted beyond the endurance of physical strength?” We wish to overstate nothing; but, without hunting through report after report, we shall make one more extract from Mr. Saunders. He says—

“Mr. Baker reports having seen several females, who he was sure could only just have completed their eighteenth year, who had been obliged to work fourteen hours and a half every day, from six A.M. to ten P.M., with only one hour and a half in the interim for meals. In other cases females are obliged to work all night in a temperature from seventy to eighty.....Mr. Baker says, ‘If masters want hands to work long hours, let them employ men; to employ females such hours, when men are to be had, and doing nothing, is a curse upon the system, which ought to be put down. My week’s lists refer you to some instances which I consider cruelty, though it may be voluntary, for, God help them, the hands dare not refuse.’”

More Englishmen will be found to sympathize with Mr. Baker’s warm expressions of sympathy, than with the Doctor’s cold philosophy. Mr. Horner tells us, in his Report of the 11th of October, 1843—

“That many women work for thirteen, some for fourteen, and some for seventeen hours. Some are at constant work from six in the morning till twelve at night, less only by two hours for meals and rest.....What constitution can hold out long against incessant toil of

this description? Its fatal tendency is daily shown in the manufacturing districts, by the ravages it makes on human life."

And yet we are told that "hours of labour are never protracted beyond the endurance of physical strength!" The physical strength of the factory women, whom Dr. Taylor has seen, must be enduring indeed. Again, "the few industrial branches open to woman's labour." Is it not notorious that female labour is being extensively substituted for male? And should not the author of "*The Natural History of Society*" know that men are most barbarous where women are most worked and drudged? Mr. Leonard Horner, at the meeting of the Society for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor, observes—

"The other evil to which I refer is the derangement of the social system, by the custom, which has of late years become so prevalent, of substituting female for male labour—a custom which has the most corrupting influence, and produces the worst effects upon the male part of the population. One of the necessary consequences, in the case of married women, is the abandonment of the maternal duties. Within a very short time after they have given birth to a child (and we may observe that they work up to almost the moment of their confinement) they return to their work, and commit their infants to the care of women who are called professional nurses, who take as many as they can get, and sometimes do some work besides. To diminish their trouble, these women are in the habit of administering opiates to the poor infants; and there are two drugs of this sort well known, the one of which is called Godfrey's Cordial, and the other goes by a very significant name—Atkinson's Quietness. I have been informed, on unquestionable authority, that in one street in Manchester there are three druggists or grocers who each sell five gallons a week of these opiates. As the dose is about a teaspoonful at a time, you may easily imagine to what an extent this pernicious practice prevails; and I have been told, by the same competent authority, that the average quantity given daily is equal to a hundred drops of laudanum. In this way infanticide is practised to a great extent, and those infants that survive grow up rickety, stunted, and feeble."

We want the women of England to be in a better position than Indian squaws; but, in truth they are, in one respect, in a worse, for the squaws have their children with them, whilst English mothers leave theirs to hireling and bad care.

One step in advance has been made; by the new law no woman is allowed to work more than twelve hours, no matter what may be her age. This is something gained. If we chose we could draw a much worse and yet a faithful picture of the labour which women and children perform in factories. Any man who has a heart to feel, will admit that Government superintendence was imperiously called for. We think, however, that

we have quoted sufficiently from Dr. Taylor's book to justify our opinion that it is not a fair view of the factory system; at the same time, it is useful to see the favourable side of the question; and we are ready to admit that many of the evils attached to the system are attributable to the "great town nuisance," where masses of beings, huddled together in an impure and dark atmosphere, generate disease and immorality. The author's remarks on this head are valuable; and we were pleased also to have grouped before us the pictures of comfort and happiness which the Doctor has truly drawn of the life of those factory families where work is abundant and masters benevolent. Of the Amendment Act itself we cannot now say much—the limitations which it has imposed on labour, and the provisions which it makes for education, are, so far as they go, good. On the 11th of July, 1839, Lord John Russell fairly put the question of the Ten Hours Bill.

"It seems to me the noble lord (Ashley) has not answered the question, whether, having reduced the hours of labour, he can provide, at the same time, that the same remuneration shall be given for the shortened hours of labour?..... Whatever shortens the hours of labour, and with the present high price of provisions reduces the rate of wages, instead of being a proposition of humanity, would be a proposition of great inhumanity; therefore, as I think the proposition, if carried into effect, would be cruel in its operation, I must vote against it."

It is not a little in favour of the Ten Hours Bill, that, after five years' additional experience, the same noble lord has entirely changed his opinion, and voted for it. On the ground of humanity, let the question rest. We care not for the reduction of the mill-owners' profits, except so far as it operates to lessen capital and employment; gold cannot be weighed in the balance with human suffering. But are the operatives prepared to bear the reduction of wages? Do they not believe that wages would not be reduced? For them only are we interested; and we feel that we cannot blame the Ministry, with all the responsibility of office upon their shoulders, for being nervously apprehensive of going too far. They had a duty to discharge painful to their feelings, as well as disagreeable to their supporters. They, no doubt, remembered the severe distress of those by-gone years, when the complaint of the operatives was, not that the work was too much, but that there was none at all; and when trade was but beginning to revive, Ministers dreaded placing a restriction on it. We confidently hope that their fears are groundless, and that the success of the present measure will embolden them to go further; for we must deplore the hard fate of those who, from the tender age of thirteen, are doomed to a life of toil, where there is little time

for rest, and none for improvement. Meantime, it behoves our clergy to labour earnestly in storing with knowledge those children who, under that age, have granted them the opportunity of being taught; and even after the hours of toil are over we bid them to speak to the young and hard-worked operatives words of consolation and of Christian hope. These are not the times in which it is safe for a nation to repose in the lap of ignorance. "Everything in the condition of mankind announces the approach of some great crisis, for which nothing can prepare us but the diffusion of knowledge, probity, and the fear of the Lord." Let us, at least, mitigate those evils which we cannot altogether naturally avoid.

We must hasten to a conclusion: we have not space to notice the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, nor the foreign policy of Ministers, which seems to draw together, into one bond of union and of friendly intimacy, the potentates of Europe, assuring to their respective people the blessings of peace and concord.

Has the country, then, gained by a Conservative Ministry, and has our retrospect satisfied us? Let us see. Do they exhibit "the disposition to preserve and the ability to improve?" We have a Ministry who maintain the Constitution, as established in the three estates of Queen, Lords, and Commons—a Ministry, members of the Established Church, and, we believe, determined to maintain her in connection with the State. We found this belief on the declarations of the Duke of Wellington, on the tried attachment of Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham; and, despite his "overpowering necessity" speech, on the conviction of the Premier. As Lord Stanley's expressions* are so fresh and so straightforward, we give them:—

"Against the confiscation of Church property I will raise my voice as long as I have a voice to raise within the walls of Parliament..... This I will say, that while I believe the bulk of the people of England is firmly determined to do full and substantial justice, in respect of the civil rights of their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, in common, I believe, with the vast majority of the people of England, I entertain a fixed and unaltered determination to maintain and uphold the Protestant Establishment of this country."

We have a united Ministry, opposed to vote by ballot, universal suffrage, and triennial Parliaments—a Ministry anxious for the preservation of peace, determined to give no insult to foreign powers, at the same time to take none; earnest for the spread of commerce and the extirpation of slavery. We believe we have a free-trade Ministry, with the exception of conferring pro-

* On Lord John Russell's motion for an enquiry into the state of Ireland.

tection on corn and sugar, and imposing a series of differential duties for the advantage of our colonies—a Ministry who will maintain the supremacy of the laws and the integrity of the empire at every risk ; who, nevertheless, are somewhat dilatory and somewhat temporizing, permitting a gaming indemnity law to pass, and postponing the amendment of the Poor Law—and, in fine, we have a Ministry who equalize revenue with expenditure—who establish a sound system of currency—who found the country with an embarrassed exchequer and a drooping trade, and who, in less than three years, made the exchequer free and trade flourishing.

Have we stated its measures fairly ? Have we sketched its character truly ? And if so, what would be the sentence of the people of England ?

ART. VII.—*The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy ; or, a Dissertation on the Prophecies which treat of the Grand Period of Seven Times, and especially of its Second Moiety, or the Latter Three Times and a Half.* By G. STANLEY FABER. Second Edition. London : Painter. 1844. Three vols. 12mo.

WHENSOEVER we turn our thoughts to the subject of prophecy we are filled with wonder, and reverence, and praise—in thinking of the grace of God in making known to man his purposes and plans for the government of the world ; of the condescension there is in his having vouchsafed such continual guidance to the Church, as a light to her feet and a lamp to her paths ; and of the wisdom and mercy displayed in the mystery which surrounds these communications ; so that while they repel or evade the presumptuous and merely intellectual scrutiny of the unprepared or profane, they become to the Church, taught by the Holy Spirit, and having the eye of faith to penetrate the mystery—they become, and we say it advisedly, her clearest light and her most strong consolation. Among the chances and changes of this transitory life we need an anchor of hope, sure and steadfast—this we have within the veil ; but by the light of prophecy our eye is carried even now within the veil, and we may even now look, not at the things which are seen and temporal, but at the things which are unseen and eternal. It is a light shining in a dark place, and leading us onward until the day dawn and the day-star arise in our hearts. It came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

That prophecy came from God is evidenced, not only by such express declarations as those to which we have just referred, but also by the internal evidence of the prophecies themselves, to those who have considered the purpose of all prophecy, and have studied the subject, comparing the declarations with the accomplishment, having this original purpose continually borne in mind. The intent of prophecy was not to gratify the curiosity of man—its primary intent was not even to inform and direct the Church; it has a higher purpose than this—its first intention was, that God might be known thereby, as declaring future things before any signs or tokens of them appeared, so that, in the accomplishment of these declarations, it might be known that he who spake these words looked into futurity with unerring certainty, because the end to be accomplished was that which he from the beginning had purposed, and because his own Almighty arm would sustain and effectuate that purpose; and that thus it might become manifest that HE ALONE is God. The idols of the heathen are scornfully invited to a competition with Jehovah in this respect:—

“Let *them* show us what shall happen: let them show the former things what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are *gods*.” (Isaiah xli. 23).

The conditions required in the test are—first, that it shall be shown what will happen; secondly, that when it has happened, it shall be shown that there was no such necessary connexion between the *former* things, when the word was spoken, and the *latter end* of them, when it was accomplished, that natural sagacity could foresee such an accomplishment; thirdly, that things yet future—things that are to come *hereafter*, should also be declared, that we may not stand still, idly gazing with wonder on the past, but go on in the hands of the same God, with whom past, present, and future are all one; and so move forward with the course of that Providence which is ever evolving, from that which we call futurity, fresh additions to the monuments of the glory of God in the accomplishment of his word in past times, and a consequent enlargement of our wonder, adoration, and praise.

Thus viewed, it becomes a condition of prophecy that its accomplishment shall not be so obvious as to seem to be attributable to natural causes, and thus appear unworthy of God; nor yet that its declarations concerning those things, in accomplishing which man would take part, should be so plain, that some might vainly try to accelerate, and others madly

endeavour to frustrate, the counsels of the Most High. Prophecy, in its grandeur and in its mystery, rises above these dangers; it treats of those grand movements which affect the whole Church, or in which nations, or heads of nations, are the instruments; and it is couched in so lofty a strain, that while enough is revealed to encourage and guide the Church, man is not tempted thereby so to forecast the purposes of God as either, in foolish zeal, to entertain the thought of helping to accomplish that purpose; or, on the other hand, with insane hostility, try to counteract, by the puny efforts of worms of the dust, events to be wrought out by the arm of Almighty God.

Even as it is, there have been instances of men capable of these egregious absurdities, infatuated by their hostility to the truth of God; like Porphyry, who asserted that the prophecies of Daniel were written after the events, as there could not otherwise, he said, be so exact a correspondence between the predictions and their accomplishment; or the Emperor Julian, who attempted to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, for the avowed purpose of defeating the words of long desolation pronounced upon it both by Daniel and by our Lord. And it is expressly written in several places, in which the fulfilment of the divine announcements is recorded, that the disciples knew not the meaning of the things at the time, but afterwards remembered that they were written of old, and saw that they were then fulfilled; or that the perpetrators of the crimes had done it ignorantly in unbelief, and knew not the Scriptures; for if they had known them, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. Ignorance, therefore, of the full meaning of the prophetic Scriptures, previous to the fulfilment, is a condition necessary for their accomplishment.

Prophecy is often taken, in a large and generic sense, for the whole Scripture, and for every divine declaration. Every part of Scripture may, in some sense, be called prophetic, as even the facts which it records are either typical of future events, or mere beginnings of a series of acts, and preparation of materials for future acts, more fully to reveal at some future time the being and perfections of God. Even the creation itself, however complete in one sense, as bringing all matter into being, had yet another tale to tell, when of that created matter a portion was incorporated with the person of the Son of God through incarnation, and when Christ thereby became able to say—"He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." It had yet another tale to tell, when, in consequence of the coming of Christ, and his return to the bosom of the Father after the work which he came to do was finished, the promised Com-

forter was given to the Church, and men were empowered by the Holy Ghost to do works like to those of Christ, yea, and even greater works, because he was gone to the Father. And the whole creation is destined to tell yet another tale of truth in the ages to come, which purpose, though seeming to be frustrated, was only interrupted by the fall, and shall yet be told out with all fulness in the new creation and the kingdom of heaven.

This is no speculation, but forms the theme and climax of all those portions of Scripture which are held to be, *par excellence*, and by the common consent of all men, PROPHETIC. It is declared in the eighth Psalm, a declaration taken up and further explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is further shown by St. Paul that the glory which Christ has already received at the right hand of the Father has not exhausted the prophecy in the Psalm, but only fulfils one portion, the necessary preliminary to the remainder; but that it is by Christ's coming a second time, and without a sin-offering, unto salvation, that the entire purport of this prophecy shall be accomplished, and the name of the Lord our God becomes most excellent throughout all the earth. And all the types refer to this final consummation: and Enoch prophesied of this second coming of the Lord; and Abraham rejoiced in distant prospect of this day, when in his seed all the families of the earth shall be blessed. Yea, and every act of our Saviour's life, and all the many parables which he spake, had reference to a kingdom which is even yet future; and his last discourse concerning the destruction of Jerusalem declares the time—the long distant time when he spake the words—for Jerusalem should be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled; but the same discourse also gives signs of the approaching termination of that long period, which signs the Church is required to mark, that they may be prepared for that great event which shall conclude the Gentile dispensation, and usher in that of the new creation, or the kingdom of heaven—even the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, in like manner as the first disciples saw him go up into heaven. (Acts i.) And by observation of these signs, and faith in these declarations of Christ, very many among the studious and thoughtful in the present generation of the Church are convinced that the end of the present dispensation and the time of the second advent draw near.

It is the deep interest which we know to be taken in prophecy generally, at the present time, which induces us to direct

our attention to that particular branch of it which Mr. Faber especially treats on—the consecutive and chronological prophecies, and especially those of the Apocalypse, as being more immediately connected with the Gentile dispensation and the Christian Church. Those who are not aware of the interest which is generally felt, may in some degree estimate it by referring to “Bickersteth on the Prophecies,” or any other popular manual, and looking over the long list of publications on prophetic subjects which have recently appeared, a class of writing which has gone on progressively increasing and multiplying up to the hour in which we are now writing. And if, after all this, any still continue to doubt whether there really are any prophecies applicable to our own times, and do not rather doubt their own judgment for its singularity—if any continue still irreclaimable *preterists* or *futurists*, as Mr. Faber classes them, we must give them up as irreclaimable. We cannot ourselves entertain the question—we cannot sufficiently feel with, or approximate towards, those who do entertain it, to do them any good; we should only anger them by seeming to treat them cavalierly. It appears to us a monstrous supposition to hold that those Scriptures to which the Church, in all past ages, looked for light and guidance, are no light to us, but refer to things long past, or still future, and not to things present. And still less can we entertain the supposition, that the Christian dispensation, subsisting through eighteen hundred years, to which all preceding dispensations which have been the subjects of prophecy have confessedly led, and for which they have prepared, should itself have been omitted in prophecy—should not have been especially regarded in prophecy. Nay, on the contrary, we believe and assert that the Christian dispensation has been in an especial manner the subject of prophecy, and that it has some books, such as the Apocalypse, exclusively its own.

Large portions of Isaiah are indisputably to be referred to the time of the Christian dispensation, not only their internal evidence compelling us, but the clearness of their sequence being such, that some of them which speak of the man of sorrows, and others which were appropriated by Christ in his saying, “This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears;” the necessary consequence is, that the succeeding portions belong to Christian times, and lead on to the new heavens and the new earth. (Isaiah lxi. 17). And this is so generally acknowledged, that Isaiah has been very commonly called the Evangelical prophet. Large portions of Hosea, Micah, and Zechariah, are in like manner applicable, and with almost the same force

of demonstration, to the Christian Church. And we have only to apply the same process of reasoning to the prophecies of Daniel, which are chronological and numerical, to convince us that these have such points of connexion and such clearness of sequence as will oblige us to carry the symbols and numbers of Daniel into the Christian dispensation, like the spiritual and doctrinal characteristics of the prophet Isaiah.

We have not the smallest doubt concerning the ordinary interpretation of the seventy weeks in Daniel. We are sure that they cover the whole period of time from the age of Daniel to the coming of Messiah, and consequently believe that a day is put for a year in this symbolic number. But this being so, consistency and common sense lead us to expect that the other numbers in the same prophecies should follow the same rule, and that other periods of days will also denote corresponding periods of years, unless it be clearly declared that it is not so, and these other numbers can be shown to be exceptions to the rule which has been established in the case of the seventy weeks. We say established, as this is the *shortest* of the periods, and therefore was the first accomplished, and all the longer periods must follow the same rule; but the more so, as it is the most *important* of the periods, as indicating the time when the Messiah should come. And as he is the Alpha and Omega of all prophecy, and all facts rest upon him for their basis and stay, so the period which marks his coming is the measure of all the other periods, which are only consequences of his coming and preparations for his return. And the rule, being established in Daniel, of course comes into operation in the Apocalypse also; the numbers in this latter book being derived principally from Daniel, and nothing appearing to prevent their following the same rule in both cases. We believe, therefore, that in all instances when numbers are used symbolically, a day uniformly denotes a year.

A principle thus simple being uniformly established, men would naturally conclude that all difficulty would be at an end—we should only need to fix one of the periods, and the others would join on or fall in with this one, and a simple system would be the result; and men might read off the intended events with as much confidence as they read the calculations of an almanack. But fortunately it is not so; men may not thus presume, or if they do, it will be only to shame themselves and expose their own folly. For that which forms the chief difficulty is fixing with precision any one point of time whatsoever before the adoption of our present mode of reckoning from the incarnation; and this mode of reckoning did not

begin till the eighth century, or about A.D. 750; so that even the incarnation itself we are unable to determine to the very year, and with absolute certainty. And for all other periods, such as the commencement or termination of the captivity in Babylon, or the exact time of Daniel's several visions, we are still more at a loss, since another element of confusion is brought in through the enormous discrepancies between the different standards of computation—the ancient Hebrew and the modern Rabbinical dates differing so widely from each other, and the Septuagint differing from both of these, and all of them from the Persian and Babylonian reckonings. We cannot cut the knot of this difficulty in the way that some have done, by assuming triumphantly three little points, which we should require proof of, and could not receive *instantly*, or allow any advocate of the Septuagint chronology to take thus for granted. It is assumed that the Evangelists quoted uniformly from the Septuagint; and, secondly, it is assumed that this use of the Septuagint by inspired men has given to the dates of the Septuagint the sanction of inspiration, or the seal of the Holy Ghost; and, thirdly, that this version, being in the hands of the Church, has therefore come down uncorrupted to us, and is worthy of the most entire confidence. We demur, and ask for proof of these assertions.

Moreover, it does not seem to have been the way of God, at any time, to reveal beforehand the exact period in which the measure of iniquity would become full, and he should be constrained to visit a people in judgment. In this respect it has always been observable, that it is not in man to know the times and the seasons which God has kept in his own power. A period could scarcely be named with greater precision than was that of the bondage of the Israelites in the land of Egypt, and an individual could scarcely be named more likely to be correctly informed when those four hundred and thirty years commenced, and when, by necessary consequence, they would terminate, than Moses, who recorded all these transactions. Yet it is manifest that Moses had *miscalculated* the termination of this period, and sought to deliver the Israelites forty years *too soon*; and when, after forty years sojourn in Midian, he, on the *second* attempt, did deliver them, it is recorded they came up out of Egypt on the *self-same day* that the four hundred and thirty years expired which God had *promised* of to Abram. How Moses came to know it *then*, though he knew it not *at first*, we are not told; and we only adduce it as an instance of what we mean to avow, namely, that we think it quite possible for all the great epochs to have been determined with

the most strict exactness from the beginning *in the mind of God*, and to have been spoken of to man with such clearness as to secure belief in them as coming events, and produce watchfulness and preparation ; and yet so guardedly spoken of as to hide pride from man, and keep all alike and continually dependent upon God until his purposes are accomplished : and man cannot meddle or mar, but is constrained to acknowledge the hand of the ONLY BEING who knows the end from the beginning.

And when we think of a still more important event than the Exode—the most important event, not to one nation only, but to all mankind—the incarnation of the Son of God, and find that this most important and ever memorable act of God, which was prophesied of from the very fall of man, with more and more minuteness and exactness as the time drew near ; the line in which he should come and the place in which he should be born being declared, and the time fixed with the greatest appearance of precision by the prophecy of Daniel of the seventy weeks ; and yet, notwithstanding the paramount importance of the event, and the extraordinary number of particulars given beforehand, in order to rivet attention and prevent mistake, we find that men did not know the time beforehand, and could not say that this or that is the year in which Messiah must needs appear, and that we cannot from such data even now demonstrate the very year in which his birth took place ; we greatly doubt whether men will ever be enabled confidently to assert beforehand the exact time of the events affecting the Church, all of which are confessedly of far inferior importance to that great event from whence the Church derives its origin.

We have no doubt of the fact that God has appointed fixed times for all things, just as he created the earth in six days ; and we also believe that every great event is foreseen, and that with such accuracy that it must needs take place on the self-same day to which, by this prescience of God, it has been prophetically fixed. Yet God himself is not bound by a fate, and it must be resolved into the full and perfect omniscience which we must ever ascribe unto God ; and as, in the very terms of the proposition, it is God's sole prerogative, and the ascription of it to any creature is excluded, so the mode of its operation is also known only to God—is a point of faith like omniscience itself ; and the highest order of created beings will never be able to comprehend how exact prescience in God and moral responsibility in man, as resulting from the exercise of the will, are reconciled. We believe it—we experience the comfort

of this faith—we care not to understand it. And so, while we are perfectly sure that there are grand periods during which the several operations of God are being effected, and are further convinced that seven is the primary number which forms the root and basis for calculating all the other periods, as it begins with creation, and expands into the jubilean and other typical seasons, till it enlarges into Mr. Faber's grand period of seven times, and so runs on to the completion of the purpose of God; yet we doubt whether, while these great events are in course of operation, any man will be able to fix and appropriate these subdivisions of time to their several events with perfect certainty. We think that for such certainty we must wait for the final accomplishment of the whole, and look back upon the whole as a past, a completed thing; not as partly past, partly present and future, and so in an unperfected condition. And to this we attribute, and by this principle we justify, the changes which Mr. Faber and every other interpreter has been occasionally constrained to make in some of the applications of their systems—changes rather ascribable to the imperfection of man than to the defective principle of the system. And Mr. Faber is entitled to every praise for his boldness in retracting an opinion when no longer sure of its truth.

And as in the repeating circle of Borda the multiplication of observations diminishes the chances of error, and makes one inaccuracy to disappear in the process of continuing to investigate, so in the prosecution of the study of prophecy there is a continual correction of preceding errors and a nearer approximation to the truth. Sir Isaac Newton observed in his day, and when but little comparatively had been done in the way of systematic interpretation, that “amongst the interpreters of the last age there is scarce one of note who hath not made some discovery worth knowing; and thence I seem to gather that God is about opening these mysteries..... But if the last age, the age of opening, these things, be now approaching, as by the great successes of late interpreters it seems to be, we have more encouragement than ever to look into these things.” And then, with a sagacity which is almost prophetic, Newton had observed that the Apocalypse is the key to all other prophecies, and that our understanding of it and them waited for the accomplishment of one great event or revolution referred to in all of them, and apparently near at hand in his day. “For he that will understand the old prophets must begin with this (the Apocalypse); but the time *is not come* for understanding them perfectly, because *the main revo-*

lution predicted in them is not yet come to pass. In the days of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God shall be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.....Then the signal revolutions predicted by all the holy prophets will at once both turn men's eyes upon considering the predictions, and plainly interpret them."

That which the sagacity of Newton led him to expect is become to us matter of fact and subject of history. A revolution, unexampled in atrocity, in extent, and in its consequences, has occurred; the whole aspect of Christendom has taken a new phase; another era has since begun, and that not in Christendom only, but thence extending, so as to compass the earth and give an altered character to the whole world—the phial seems poured into the air, and all mankind breathe nothing less than juvenescence and all its fancied grand results. And it is also a notorious fact, that on the breaking out of that revolution men's eyes were turned to the prophecies of Scripture in a remarkable degree, and have understood the whole scheme of prophecy far better than before; and many have made, and as we think with much reason, that revolution a salient point of time from whence they might calculate and fix other great epochs belonging to the Christian dispensation.

Among the vast numbers of the champions of prophecy which the French revolution called into the field, the two veterans, Faber and Cuninghame, seem to be the only survivors. And this we suspect will be the case in a literary sense, for the works of these two writers embody the substance of two schools of interpretation, as we may say; give all that can be said in favour of these apparently opposite systems; and put the question far clearer, and better, and more intelligibly than it can be found in any other writings we are acquainted with. We call them opposite, not as contradictory to each other, but as implying an opposite course of study—Mr. Faber having begun with Daniel, and carried the study of Daniel downwards into the Apocalypse; Mr. Cuninghame having begun with the Apocalypse, and ascended to the times of Daniel. And these opposite courses of study have certainly affected some of the views which they have respectively taken of the synchronisms or parallel passages of the Apocalypse, but not materially the general results, as bearing upon the Christian Church generally, and especially upon our own times. Both systems make the Papal power to be designated as Babylon, and the mystery of iniquity, and the little horn, though Mr. Cuninghame dates its rise, or rather its oppression of the saints, from the year of Christ 533, while Mr. Faber does not reckon its commencement till A.D. 604.

This difference of opinion concerning the commencement of the 1,260 years of Papal oppression formed the chief point of the controversy which was amicably carried on for many years between Mr. Cuninghame and Mr. Faber. But the former strongly protests against the inference which some would draw from hence, either that the whole of prophecy is involved in obscurity, or that there is uncertainty in this period, because this difference of opinion concerning its commencement exists. "Mr. Penn reasons, that because a controversy of some years existed between Mr. Faber and myself on the subject of the commencement and close of that prophetic period, therefore the period itself is unintelligible in point of fact, and uncertain, hypothetical, and equivocal. This argument would indeed confine the range of intelligible scriptural truth within very narrow limits; for what parts of the Evangelical system have not, in a similar manner, been the subjects of controversy? And, to quote an example nearer in point, does it follow, because Daniel's prophecy of seventy weeks is still subject of controversy, as to its commencement and end, that therefore the period itself is uncertain, equivocal, and unintelligible?" (xvi.) And Mr. Faber would agree with Mr. Cuninghame in taking for granted all the great points of prophetic interpretation, and say with him—"I take for granted that the four beasts seen by Daniel in the seventh chapter of his prophecies signify [the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman monarchies; and that the little horn of the fourth beast is a symbol of the Papal power; and likewise that the Babylon of the Apocalypse is the Church of Rome. These may be considered as *first principles* in the study of prophecy, of which no well instructed Protestant ought to be ignorant; and it is not reasonable to expect that every one who takes up his pen on the subject of prophecy should return back to prove anew those first principles which few persons call in question, and which have already been established in the writings of the ablest commentators." (iv.) This was written in 1813, and has acquired still greater force by the lapse of thirty years.

Taking these first principles for granted, the whole difficulty of interpreting the Apocalypse may be said to lie in rightly adjusting the triple series of sevens—the seals, the trumpets, and the vials—whether they denote twenty-one periods of time and twenty-one events in orderly sequence, or whether they denote seven grand periods of time, with subdivisions in these grand periods denoted by larger subdivisions in the trumpets and smaller subdivisions in the vials; whether, in short, the chapters in the Apocalypse itself follow in orderly succession—the events of one chapter terminating before those

in the following chapter begin, or whether the different visions are to be regarded, as in many cases, referring to the same period of time under different aspects, such as the Papal oppression of the Western Church and the Mohammedan oppression of the Eastern; and so are visions which, if not altogether synchronous, do in some degree overlap each other in almost all cases.

The first and most natural conclusion in reading any book is, that the events occur in consecutive order; but it is soon perceived that this will not apply to the successive visions of the Apocalypse, the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of which, in their middle portions, refer to the same prophetic period of 1,260, and must therefore necessarily be parallel, and not consecutive, visions; and many similar instances of synchronism occur to every student. Mede did much towards determining this principle, and we could wish that Mr. Faber had followed Mede in this respect more closely than he has done, for we think that the partial abandonment of this principle is the weak point in Mr. Faber's system of interpretation. We might at first be disposed to concede the point, for which Mr. Faber contends in opposition to Mede, "that as the seventh seal comprehends all the seven trumpets, so the seventh trumpet comprehends all the seven vials" (vol. i., p. 254), in general terms; but when the consequence is deduced, that the action of the seals has ceased when that of the trumpets has begun, this is a consequence which we cannot admit; for we believe that the action of the seventh chapter—of sealing the servants of God—subsists through the whole of the visions, being referred to expressly (ix. 4) during the action of the trumpets and (xiv. 1) the final triumph. And therefore on this point we rather agree with Mr. Cuninghame, who says, "that the commonly received interpretation of the sixth seal is erroneous, and that it refers not to anything that took place in the time of Constantine, but to the final revolution which is to precede the second advent of our Lord.....that Rev. vi. 12-17, and xi. 15-19, are completely synchronical..... that I agree with all the later interpreters of prophecy in thinking that the seventh trumpet sounded at the era of the French revolution. And as I have already endeavoured to show that the earthquake of the sixth seal is the same with that of the seventh trumpet, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that, if these opinions be correct, the sixth seal also commenced at the revolution in France, and the earthquake therein mentioned is to be applied to that revolution."—*Cuninghame*, p. 24.

It would be obviously impossible, within our narrow limits, to do justice to Mr. Faber's argument, or state out fully our own objections; and we have only referred to this difference of opinion in order that it may not be used as an argument against the interpretations of all modern writers on prophecy, by pointing to the disagreement between two of the most eminent of them. Truth is many-sided, and men may agree in general principles, yet be at issue concerning some of the details; and all the writers we allude to are agreed on the broad general principle that the Apocalypse is designed for the instruction of the Church throughout all ages, and the warning her against particular forms of evil, and especially that of the Papacy; and that this instruction and warning would be more necessary than ever in the last days, and in proportion as the end draws near; for judgment shall begin at the house of God: and what shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?

Mr. Faber, commencing his sacred calendar of seven prophetic times—the times of the Gentiles, or of the four great Gentile empires, with the era of the metallic image (Dan. xi. 31, B.C. 657), makes the opening of the first seal of the Apocalypse to take place thus early: and beginning thus early, there is time enough for all the seals to find corresponding events, and the four first of the trumpets also, and yet leave the fifth trumpet applicable to the Turkish power, to which, by universal consent, it has been fixed by the locusts and other characteristic marks of devastation and time. Mr. Faber fixes A.D. 604 for the bisection of his grand period of seven prophetic times, or 2,520 years, and the consequent commencement of the 1,260 years of the Papal apostasy, which is symbolized by the little horn of Dan. vii. 25; and the Mohammedan imposture, or the little horn of Dan. viii. 9, he fixes A.D. 608. Both these dates, we think, need correction, as we believe the edicts of Justinian, A.D. 533, which was a date first pointed out by Mr. Cuninghame, form by far the most striking fulfilment of all the prophetic requirements concerning the Papacy; and their own era of the Hégira, A.D. 622, ought, as a matter of course, to be taken as the chronological mark of the commencement of the Mohammedan scourge of the Church. The seventh trumpet Mr. Faber makes to have sounded A.D. 1789, when the French revolution began, so that here he coincides with Mr. Cuninghame; and the year 1864 is fixed upon for the termination of the sacred calendar, or the times of the Gentiles.

For further satisfaction on these points we must refer our

readers to Mr. Faber's volumes, where they will find thorough knowledge, great learning, strict integrity, and Christian temper, all brought to bear on this most important subject. And few we suppose will take up these volumes without gratefully remembering the many other important services which have been rendered to the Church by the venerable author. In the latest of his writings—the "Provincial Letters"—we find the same vigour of mind and stronghold of the truth which characterized his earlier productions. Long may he continue to enjoy it, and thus have the power, as we know he has ever the will, to step forth, like another Entellus, whenever a boaster has to be silenced, or his country needs a champion.

ART. VIII.—*A New Spirit of the Age.* Edited by R. H. HORNE, Author of "Orion." Two vols. London: Smith, Elder, and Co.

WE were prepared to receive a remarkable book from the hands of Mr. Horne, and we are only just to him and to ourselves in saying that we have not been disappointed. The author of an epic poem published at a *farthing* would not degrade himself into the humble and unattractive proprieties of common sense; he would feel, with a very celebrated ridiculer of dull poems in a former century, that the peculiar advantage of being considered a wit consists in the greater freedom which that character affords; and perhaps, in some still hour of reflection, he might remember another saying of the same person, not less deserving of recollection—that false critics rail at false wits, as impostors perpetually caution the public to beware of *counterfeits*, and never cease to decry the cheats of others, in order to make more way for their own. The book which Mr. Horne has presented to us is styled, with a modesty and reserve that are quite touching, *A NEW SPIRIT OF THE AGE*. The child of many fathers, it seems to have enjoyed the rare privilege of adoption, and to have been nurtured into maturity for the printing press under the paternal solicitude of Mr. Horne. Whether in any particular features it be possible for a familiar eye to trace an interesting resemblance to the physiognomy of "Orion," or whether the education and shaping of a very ill-grown and inharmonious MS. be the only obligation under which this "New Spirit" lies to its editor, is a question calculated to suggest many ingenious historic doubts, if a Walpole or a Whately were inclined to take up the enquiry.

VOL. XVI.—M

We turned to the subject, to which the title-page of these volumes allured us, with considerable interest. Whatever be the faults, the vices, the misfortunes of the present age, it has a decided character: its features may be repulsive, but they are marked—its expression may be effeminate, but it is original. The most indifferent spectator could not mistake this century for the preceding. In its impudence, its audacity—in its hypocrisy, in its activity, in its universality, in its utilitarianism—in each and in all it claims the distinction of originality. If any age demands a censor, it is our own—a censor whose praise should be awakened only by the love of the pure and the true, and whose indignation should be kindled by nothing, except

“The strong antipathy of good to bad.”

This representation of the spirit of our times embraces two collections of persons, arranged, or rather disarranged, according to the impulse of the contributors in sending their MSS. to the editor, or the pleasure of the editor in transmitting them to the printer. It ought, indeed, to be observed, that in these volumes we only possess a specimen of what a literary art-union proposes to accomplish in future days; only a single brick of that splendid palace of criticism and philosophy which these associated architects are engaged to construct; only one plate of that magnificent glass in which the form of the age—religious, poetical, romantic, scientific—is to be reflected in all its graceful amplitude of stature and glowing consciousness of beauty. It might, therefore, seem to be unjust to complain of the superficial lightness of the subjects thus introduced to our notice, when a superstructure of so much dignity and strength is promised to the reader, upon the single condition of his admiring the foundation. Genius, we know, is guided by its own internal radiancy of judgment, and despises all ordinary means of propulsion, since its wheels are instinct with the faculty of motion. In objecting, therefore, to the construction of these books, we are summoning the writers before a tribunal whose jurisdiction they deny, and subjecting them to the action of those laws of common sense which it is the impelling passion of their minds to repeal; we shall therefore only observe, that while in the works of other architects it is usual to lay the *foundation*, and to raise the turrets upon the fabric, in the present instance we behold the architectural practice reversed, and the turrets suspended in the absence of a foundation. The boast of the Italian architect is realized once more—Horne treads upon the heels of Michael Angelo: and in the “*Spirit of the Age*,” as in

the cathedral of St. Peter, magnificent domes of visionary speculation are seen hanging in the air, in all the sublime vastness of vacancy.

The contents of the first volume might have furnished some interesting topics of enquiry and reflection. We have Dickens, Lord Ashley, and Southwood Smith, the "Ingoldsby Legends," Mr. Landor, the Howits, Dr. Pusey, James, Gore, Marryat, Trollope, Talfourd, and others. Amid a very considerable quantity of objectless composition we meet with one very just remark upon Mr. Wordsworth:—"He wrote many poems that are trivial and puerile, or mere trash. Not a doubt of it. There stand the very poems still in his works—anybody can see them—the ungrateful monuments of a great poet. Weakness reared by his own hands and kept in repair to his latest day." This is well thought and well uttered. Mr. Wordsworth has fought for his errors as if he had been defending the altar and flame of poetry—the washing-tub and the abbey of Tintern seem to be alike dear to his affections; he has furnished from his own wings of imagination the feathers that are to waft the arrows of criticism, and has defaced the sumptuous beauty of his singing robes by the decorations of childhood which, in the waywardness of his obstinacy, he has fastened upon them. Hence it has happened that the fiercest opponent to the triumphal progress of Wordsworth has been Wordsworth himself, and his own hand has supplied the sword which so long barred—and perhaps still continues to bar—his entrance into the garden of national glory. It cannot be affirmed by the author of the "Excursion," as of the "Tempest," that the sublimity of his genius kept no certain rout, but rambled at hazard into all the regions of human life and manners. It is the peculiarity of Wordsworth that he always recedes from the *actor* into the *spectator*, and contemplates life rather in its element of *conception* than of *performance*. Nor is the life upon which he thus lingers the *heroical* or the *picturesque*. We hesitate to believe, whatever some passages of his writings may seem to intimate, that the story of "Cambucian bold" would have received a happy continuation from his pen, or that he would have sung with any rapturous abandonment

"Of Camball and of Algarsife,
And who had Canace to wife,
That owned the virtuous ring and glass;
And of the wondrous horse of brass
On which the Tartar king did ride."

We should look for a louder blast upon the enchanted trumpet from that remarkable person, of whom a slight sketch

is given in the present volume—*Walter Savage Landor* ; remarkable, it might be truly said, both for his talents and the unsuccessful employment of them, with a name extensively known and productions universally unknown; having eloquence and dignity of style which men are willing to receive upon trust, and publishing books which meet with every kind of reception except a *perusal*. If this observation be, in its spirit, true of the *prose* of Landor, it is true in the *letter* of his *poetry*. There are two passages, and two alone, in all his verses, which return upon the memory ; and one is the beautiful description of the moonbeam reflected upon the wet sand of the sea-shore, and the other is the murmuring of the shell when applied to the ear : and yet we cannot say of these momentary flashes of genius, in the words of Horace, that they have forced the whole poems into admiration ; or, in the expansion of Pope, that

“ One simile, that solitary shines
In the dry desert of a thousand lines,
Or lengthened thought that gleams through many a page,
Has sanctified *these* poems for an age.”

The friendly biographer in this *Spirit of our Age* quotes the assertion of Mr. Landor, in one of his prefaces, that *ten* accomplished men would be esteemed by him a sufficient audience. These, doubtless, he possesses, and more. But why has a stream of prose composition, so remarkably sweet, and musical, and transparent, never allured any reader-footstep into the solitudes of thought which it waters and keeps green ? From the Imaginary Conversations might be selected specimens of happy thought and graceful utterance, that Cowley might have written and Addison might have praised. Are none of this neglect and indifference, even of the refined and the reflective, to be traced to the vulgar audacity with which the author occasionally thrusts forward his opinions and parades his prejudices ? The sweetest landscape of Claude would disgust the eye, if some wretched limner were to sketch a Westminster polling-booth into the foreground ; and the most solemn group that the pencil of Raphael ever delineated would lose its charm of sanctity, if that distinguished American officer, who has been recently representing Napoleon with so much minute sublimity in the Egyptian Hall, were to rear his three-cornered hat in the distance. Certain it is, that the same indifference has been manifested to every production of Mr. Landor's pen. Even the charming “ Examination of William Shakspeare before Sir Thomas Lucy, Knt.,” has not escaped the benumbing stare ; and we recognize humour, not destitute of force, in

the reviewer's observation—"There is great love and reading bestowed upon Shakspeare, and much interest has been shown in all the hoaxes. Perhaps the public considered this book to be authentic."

Of a person so richly endowed by nature, and so neglected by his contemporaries, it is pleasing to receive some particulars, however slight, and a few notices are given in these pages. The sketch of his life and works opens with a picture of him when a boy at Rugby, entangling an indignant farmer in a cast net, until they had arranged between them some preliminaries of a truce, which the angling propensities of Master Savage had rendered very necessary for his peace and welfare. His early life seems, indeed, to have given no imperfect outline of his future history. His arrogance and daring followed him to Oxford, where he incurred rustication, for discharging a gun in the quadrangle of Trinity College. As he never intended to take a degree, of course he would not return to the banks of the Isis, but passed some months in London, in solitude and Italian. At this period, his godfather, General Powell, rightly perceiving the antagonistic principle of young Landor's disposition, urged him to enter the army; and when that proposal was declined, his father endeavoured to tempt him on to law and the Temple, by an annual allowance of four hundred pounds, accompanied by a threat of diminishing it very considerably in the event of a refusal. Master Landor, however, had a lively desire to pen stanzas, and none whatever to engross. He accordingly threw himself into the embrace of short metre and short allowance. He wrote Italian verses, which, if not very good, are charitably supposed to have been "not perhaps worse than Milton's." The modern poetry of the South did not captivate his fancy; he compared it, very happily, to the *juice of grapes and melons left on yesterday's plate*. A subsequent study of Dante opened a new path to his mind. His martial ardour was not quenched, and at the breaking out of the Spanish war against the French he is said to have been the first Englishman who landed in Spain, where he raised some troops at his own expense. His military labours, however, were soon over; and being resident in Paris in the beginning of the present century, he witnessed the inauguration of Napoleon into the consulship of France; and by one of those accidents which seem intended expressly to ridicule human grandeur, he "subsequently saw the dethroned and deserted emperor pass through Tours, on his way to embark for America, attended only by a single servant," and unrecognized by any person save Mr. Landor, in a city where a pointed

finger or the whisper of his name would have been inevitable destruction. The Englishman "held his breath and let him pass." In 1815, Mr. Landor went to sojourn in Italy, occupying the Palazzo Medici, in Florence. At a later period, he "purchased the beautiful and romantic villa of Lorenzo de Medici," where, we presume, he continues to reside. We have thus ran rapidly over a few pages of the first volume. The second bears the same impress as its predecessor; and if we might presume to compare the editor of the "New Spirit" to that illustrious official of whom Swift speaks, and whose bosom, from the period of his arrival at years of discretion, heaved with a call to take upon him the function of a parish clerk, certainly the companions with whom he was united in his labours of parochial immortality were no inapt emblems of the author's, whose industrious acquisitions in the Bathos have enabled their leader to produce this very extraordinary compilation. And when the author of that interesting treatise, "The Importance of a Man to Himself," informs us that it seemed to him meet and profitable to associate himself with the parish clerks of this land, such as were right worthy in their calling, men of a clear and sweet voice and becoming gravity, we almost delude ourselves into the belief—so lively is the resemblance—that we are listening to the present editor's description of his literary associates, alike worthy in their calling—sweet in their voices—unquestionable in their gravity.

The second volume contains a collection even more miscellaneous and remarkable than the first. We have Alfred Tennyson and Babington Macaulay, Thomas Hood and Theodore Hook, Knowles and Macready, James and Irish novelists, Robert Montgomery and Thomas Carlyle, &c. &c. Of these names it is certainly allowable to present some as illustrations of the age, reflections of its form, and indications of its pressure. Mr. Tennyson may claim to be taken as the representative of that school of poets, small in number, and not particularly dazzling in the manifestation of their genius, who have sought to revive in our literature the style of picturesque romance of which Spenser is the acknowledged master. Of all his disciples Mr. Tennyson is the most promising, as he is the most earnest; and we look with hope to the future productions of his pen, when time and thought shall have chastened the grotesque buoyancy of his fancy and subdued the oppressive glare of colours. If he stumble in his path to reputation, his misfortune will be occasioned by the indiscretion of his friends. A few such stories as the following would overturn any chariot

of imagination in its swiftest career:—"His ideality is both adornative and creative, although up to this period it is ostensibly rather the former than the latter. His ideal faculty is either satisfied with an exquisitely delicate arabesque painting; or clears the ground before him, so as to melt and disperse all other objects into a suitable atmosphere or aerial perspective, while he takes horse in a passionate impulse, as in some of his ballads, which seem to have been painted through without a single pause." This passage reminds us of the satire of Addison upon the discordant imagery of his time, when the stream which was roaring along to the distant main in one stanza, bristled with a real *mane* of its own in the next. And like genius of a high order in all walks of art, this critic is very happy in what may be called the cumulative evidence of taste. While the eye of the reader still swims with the bewildering vision of the poet devouring the ground and keeping his seat in a *passionate impulse*, he overwhelms him with a second illustration of his author's faculties, scarcely less astonishing; when he presents him standing, "collected and self-contained (whatever that may mean), and rolling out, with an impressive sense of dignity, orb after orb, of that grand melancholy music of blank verse which leaves long vibrations in the reader's memory." As we never, intentionally at least, talk of things which we do not understand, we shall say nothing of this paragraph, except that we wish the poet well enough to wish him to be released from his critic. Such a shower of nonsense would wash out the colours from any wing, and scatter the bloom from the feathers, more than the most driving hail and storm of censure. We feel a sort of *academic* interest in Mr. Tennyson; we only learn from the present paper that he is the son of a Lincolnshire clergyman, and has brothers and sisters living who are possessed of superior accomplishments; but we have heard of him in the shades of Trinity, and consider his prize poem on "Timbuctoo" to be one of the few compositions which do not inflict a positive disgrace upon the University, as most assuredly they administer a painful chastisement to the cultivated ears in the senate-house.

The sketch of Tennyson is followed by one, briefer, of Macaulay, whose recent publication, "*Lays of Ancient Rome*," revives that claim to the honours of song which his early ballads advanced. The prose of Mr. Macaulay is the prose of the rhetorician, and his poetry differs only from his prose in being more condensed and more decorated. We shall be offering to the author no feeble tribute of applause in expressing a conviction, that if Demosthenes had poured his indigna-

tion against Philip into an ode, it would have presented a very vivid resemblance, both in manner and expression, to some of these energetic songs, which are very properly called, "not an exhumation of decayed materials, but a reproduction of classical vitality." The objection to the metres and rhythms employed, that they are not *classical*, but *Gothic*, and therefore remind us of the "Percy Reliques," we conceive to be perfectly unfounded. That metre is the most appropriate which is the most in harmony with the train of thought and the idioms of the language adopted by the poet. Even in the translation of a poem we ought to look to the transfusion of the sentiment, not of the word; as in detailing the conversation of some eminent person we desire to be told his opinions, not his accent. We have yet to learn that even the "*Commedia*" of Dante charms the reader in proportion as the translation reflects the shape of the original; and we entertain a very lively belief that the suggestion of Walter Scott, to render the Homeric battles into a ballad metre, would, if adequately carried out, render a justice to the blind minstrel which he has never received from Chapman, Pope, Cowper, or Sotheby. We can think that the torrent of impetuous warfare, rushing like the description in "*Marmion*," would stir the heart with the sound of a trumpet. "Much has been said (writes Bishop Hurd), and with great truth, of the felicity of Homer's age for poetical manners. But as Homer was a citizen of the world, when he had seen in Greece the manners he has described, could he, on the other hand, have seen in the west the manner of the feudal ages, I make no doubt but he would certainly have preferred the latter." Our subject does not lead us to investigate the bishop's opinion; we only allude to it as illustrating the advantage which these classical lays derive from the Gothic tinge that is shed over them.

And, in truth, there is something singular in the contrast offered by these two writers of verse—Tennyson and Macaulay—thus presented side by side. For while we can think of the *first*, that he could love to mingle with those inspired brethren who,

"In sage and solemn tunes, have sung
Of tournaments and of trophies hung—
Of forests and enchantments drear,
Where more is meant than meets the ear ;"

so we can believe of the *second*, that he would find his own character portrayed by the same writer, when he said—

"Towered cities please us then,
And the busy hum of men."

The qualities that compose the vigorous declaimer, the acute

reviewer, and the dazzling rhetorician are not only useless, but pernicious, when applied to the formation of the poetical character. We have examples of orators dwindling into versifiers, in the history of two of the most famous speakers—one of ancient and the other of modern times. Antony might have repulsed the fiercest attack of Cicero if he had charged him *in an ode*; and Jeremy Taylor himself might have been put to flight before *a stanza* of Toplady!

We pass over the notices of Hood and Hook, nor feel in any way fascinated by the very *manly* portrait which introduces the writings of Miss Martineau to our regard. Her recent publication of essays, written in the chamber of sickness and suffering, has, however, excited a sympathy towards her which her numerous political writings, if remembered, would only tend to diminish. The biographical particulars here collected are not destitute of interest. Miss Martineau, the youngest of eight children, was born in the year 1802. Her father was a manufacturer in Norwich, where his family, originally of French origin, had resided since the revocation of the edict of Nantes. To the infirmity of deafness, with which she has been afflicted since early childhood, she traces that taste for literary occupation for which she has been so long distinguished. A commercial disaster, that overthrew the prosperity of her family, called all these intellectual acquirements into active employment. "She realized an income sufficient for her simple wants, but still so small as to enhance the integrity of the sacrifice which she made to principle in refusing the pension offered to her by the Government, in 1840." The religious and political opinions advocated in all the works of Miss Martineau cannot be expected to receive either our approval or our praise; but we are not insensible to the occasional outbreaks of sweet fancy, to the passages of earnest eloquence, or the sketches of vivid description, that, at long intervals, illuminate her pages. We admit, with her present panegyrist, that it is possible to be poetical without being a poet, and quote the following verses—probably new to all our readers—as an interesting specimen of serious imagination flowing unwillingly into rhyme. They are entitled, "A Song for August:"

"Beneath this starry arch
Nought resteth or is still,
But all things hold their march,
As if by one great will.
Moves one, move all;
Hark to the footfall!
On, on, for ever.

"Yon sheaves were once but seed ;
 Will ripens into deed ;
 As eave-drops swell the streams,
 Day-thoughts feed nightly dreams ;
 And sorrow tracketh wrong,
 As echo follows song.

On, on, for ever.

"By night, like stars on high,
 The hours reveal their train ;
 They whisper and go by ;
 I never watch in vain.

Moves one, move all ;
 Hark to the footfall !

On, on, for ever.

"They pass the cradle head,
 And there a promise shed ;
 They pass the moist new grave,
 And bid rank verdure wave ;
 They bear through every clime
 The harvests of all time.

On, on, for ever."

The Sick Room, from which Miss Martineau now sends forth her thoughts to the world, reminds us of another authoress—Miss Barret—whose poetical and critical writings have displayed not only considerable taste, beauty, and feeling, but whose variety and depth of erudition might seem to recall the days when fair pupils studied Plato with Roger Ascham. It is not possible, without a feeling of lively interest, to read of one, "confined entirely to her own apartment, and almost hermetically sealed, in consequence of her extremely delicate state of health, and scarcely seen by any but her own family." But though thus separated from the world, and often, during many weeks at a time, in darkness almost equal to night, Miss Barret has yet found means, by extraordinary inherent energies, to develop her inward nature ; to give vent to the soul in a successful struggle with its destiny while on earth ; and to attain and master more knowledge and accomplishments than are usually within the power of those of either sex who have every adventitious opportunity, as well as health and industry. Six or seven years of this imprisonment she has now endured, not with vain repinings, though deeply conscious of the loss of external nature's beauty ; but with resignation, with patience, with cheerfulness, and generous sympathies towards the world without ; with indefatigable work of thought, by word, by pen, and with devout faith and adoration, and a high and hopeful waiting for the time when this mortal frame "putteth on im-

mortality." Such a passage is worth fifty pages upon the humour of Mr. Dickens, or the festivity of Mr. Hook. We should be most happy to believe that resignation so holy and trustfulness so serene might in any sense be received as reflections of our age. Certain we are, that it ought then to be designated, with the strictest accuracy—a *new spirit*!

We have no power to estimate the claims of Mr. Robert Browning and Mr. J. W. Marston to be exhibited in the niche of a separate chapter to the gaze of the nation, as representatives of its present mind and poetical capacity. Our acquaintance with their compositions is wholly gathered from the criticisms in these volumes. Mr. Marston has written the "Patrician's Daughter;" and Mr. Browning is answerable for "Paracelsus." Of the last poem we are informed that a Promethean character pervades it throughout—"in the main design, as well as in the varied aspirations and struggles to attain knowledge, and power, and happiness for mankind; but at the same time there is an intense craving after the forbidden secrets of creation, and eternity, and power, which place 'Paracelsus' in the same class as 'Faust,' and in close affinity with all those works, the object of which is an attempt to penetrate the mysteries of existence—the infinity within us and without us. Need it be said that the result is in all the same? And the baffled magic—the sublime occult—the impassioned poetry, all display the same ashes which once were wings. 'Paracelsus' is an original work: its aim is of the highest kind—in full accord and harmony with the "*Spirit of the Age.*" The italics are our own; and when, in anxious hope, we search for an explanation of this harmony, we find it to consist in refining and elevating others, and in "*giving a sort of polarity to the vague impulses of mankind towards the lofty and the beneficent. It also endeavours to sound the depths of existence for hidden treasures of being.*" O rare and incomprehensible "Spirit of the Age," and expounder of that spirit equally rare, and still more incomprehensible! It is in such passages as these that the real temper of this book displays itself, and we read not the spirit of an age, but of a clique. Every chapter contains an interchange of civilities; every defect has its corresponding charm; and we can almost catch the sound of that voice in our ear which once scattered such dismay among the poetical fopplings of a former age:—

"I cough like Horace, and though lean, am short;
Ammon's great son one shoulder had too high;
Such Ovid's nose; and, Sir, you have an eye:

Go on, obliging creatures, make me see
All that disgraced my betters meet in me :
Say for my comfort, languishing in bed,
Just so immortal Nero held his head."

We have said that we know nothing of Mr. Browning's poetry, except from the quotations in the volume before us; these are brief, and we should be unjust if we refused to them all merit for melody and strength of sentiment; they display glimpses of both, and the way to enlarge them will be to imbibe the spirit of a better age, and to shape them by the rules of a better criticism.

We shall not offer any comment upon the chapter which is devoted to the ridicule of Mr. Robert Montgomery; the grotesque absurdity of the satire destroys any force it might otherwise possess; and the daring blasphemy with which the writer presumes to speak of things encircled by the most solemn sanctity and awe, awakens only a sensation of anger subdued by compassion. Mr. Montgomery has many faults, as well as merits and has committed some literary errors, of which we sincerely hope that no person is more conscious than himself; if anything be calculated to confirm him in the wrong, it would be such criticism as that before us.

While hastening to a conclusion, the remarks upon Mr. Thomas Carlyle induce us to pause for a moment. We looked with doubtful forebodings for some clear and informing review of this very singular author's habits of thought and manner of expression. We need scarcely say that we looked in vain. The paper on Carlyle is written by one of his school—one with imagination more extravagant, logic more inconclusive, and language, if possible, more barbarous. To us, who are accustomed to contemplate any new book of Mr. Carlyle with an instinctive shudder of apprehension at the terrible discord that awaits us, every imitation of his harshness has in it something frightful. It is a severe case of intellectual *chorea*, rehearsed with many additional convulsions. The following is the inimitable review of Carlyle's style of composition—of its shape, if that can be called shape which *shape has none*. We recommend this passage to our readers, in the hope that they will overlook its want of piety in its still more evident want of *sense*. "Yet if the grammarians and public teachers could not measure it out to pass as classic English, after the measure of Swift or Addison, or even of Bacon or Milton—if new words spring gauntly in it from strange derivations, and rushed together in outlandish combinations—if the collocation was distortion, wandering wildly up and down

—if the comments were everywhere in a heap, like the ‘pots and pans’ of *Bassano*, classic or not, English or not, it was certainly a true language—a language *μεροπων ανθρωπων*—the significant articulation of a living soul; God’s breath was in the vowels of it: and the clashing of these harsh compounds at last drew the bees into assembly, each murmuring his honey-dream: and the hearers who stood longest to listen became sensible of a still grave music issuing like smoke from the clefts of the rock. If it was not style and classicism, it was something better—it was soul-language. *There was a divinity at the shaping of these rough-hewn periods.*” What next? Now we have never thought of complaining that Mr. Carlyle did not write according to Addison and Temple, or Burke and Barrow, or Hooker and Tillotson, or Bacon and Milton; but that he wrote like no other Englishman, in time past, present, or, as we earnestly hope, *to come*: not that he neglected or despised the harmony of periods, the connection of sentences, and the fitness of phrases which had become consecrated to the ear of Taste by the lip of Genius, through so many successive generations; but that he introduced a manner of composition which, being neither English, German, or Latin, was a *mixture of all*—not a mixture in which the different elements of style were *held in solution*, and which, therefore, presented the active infusion of different salutary qualities of thought; but containing them in their natural state, unmodified, unsubdued, confusing, irritating, and baffling one another. The most famous of all our writers have been avowedly indifferent to the precision and uniformity of their expression. In Bishop Taylor we recognize the presence of Latin idioms continually melted into the coarser material of English thought; or, to take a very different example, in Bishop Hurd we see a frequent use of French phrases blended with the gravity of the academic manner: in both cases, however, the strong current of the original style sweeps these foreign acquisitions along with it in the depth of the stream—they are not suffered to swim upon the surface, and so discolour and hide the entire argument. Nor does this Gothic extravagance of Carlyle contribute, in any degree, to the true development of his thoughts. It makes them remarkable, simply by making them dark. One might suppose him to write with that illustrious critic, Mr. Martinus Scriblerus, constantly at his elbow. “A genuine writer of the profound (is the observation of that distinguished person) will take care never to *magnify* any object, without *clouding* it at the same time. His thought will appear in a true mist, and very unlike

what is in nature." This we consider to be a just description of Mr. Carlyle's prose; and he owes much of his popularity to his chief demerit. It is a characteristic, not only of our own, but of all ages, to esteem that which is difficult, and to honour the oracle in proportion to the mystery of its utterance. Few writers of any eminence have reproduced more old friends than Mr. Carlyle; he has not presented them with *new faces* so much as in *new costume*; he covers them with so many veils of imagery, and exhibits them in so dim a twilight of language, that it is scarcely possible to distinguish, far less to recognize, the features of our most intimate acquaintance. Vivid, picturesque, eloquent he sometimes is, notwithstanding all those appalling distortions of his intellectual frame which remind us of the uncouth contractions of Johnson climbing the tree in Thrals' orchard at Streatham; but we defy any reader, whose taste has been cultivated by the models of English or of classical grace, to say that he ever rose from any book of Mr. Carlyle's with a clear, distinct, and lasting impression. For our own part, we can compare our feelings to nothing but the sensations experienced in travelling, by night, through the Potteries of Staffordshire, where the busy watchfulness and toil of those illuminated manufactories cast a red and bewildering light over the surrounding country—a light that makes no object clear or intelligible, but confuses and pains the eye, with a mysterious and frightful combination of trees that look withered and black, dwelling in dismal and desolate, and waters into which a thunderbolt seemed to have descended without being quenched. We shall regard it as one of the most melancholy evidences of the decline of all pure and healthful literature, if the writings of Mr. Carlyle continue to have an enduring hold upon the popular mind. His natural talents will never be able to preserve from corruption and decay the hideous deformities in which he has imbedded them. And if we anticipate so early an oblivion for the master, what can be expected for the disciples? We think we read their history in the misfortune of a character not unknown in song—who, in all the desperation of stupidity and hunger,

"Then gnaw'd his pen, then dash'd it to the ground,
Sinking from thought to thought, a vast profound—
Plung'd for his sense, but found no bottom there;
Yet wrote and flounder'd on in still despair."

ART. IX.—*Coningsby; or, the New Generation.* By B. DISRAELI, Esq., M.P., Author of “Contarini Fleming.” Second Edition. Three Vols. London: Colburn. 1844.

CONVENTIONALISM, to adopt a very modern but sufficiently intelligible word, is the order of the day. Individuality of character is mostly merged in the predominant fashion of the hour, and none can deny that a visible change, be it for evil or for good, has come over the national character of old England. A paramount influence is assigned to institutions—to political machinery; while the personal character of the community is more or less disregarded. As a remedy for social difficulties, attempts have been made from time to time, during the last thirty years, to reconstruct society on a basis of material motives and calculations; but whether the substitution of the union for the parish, the board or the commission for the squire and the parson, and charitable societies for the Church, has augmented the sum of human happiness, we will not for the present discuss. Meanwhile, England is perplexed with the difficulties of her social position, and manifold are the remedies suggested for their removal or mitigation. The rising generation have been foremost in expressing their discontent with this condition of existing things, and young hearts have yearned to restore, were it possible, the days and the men of old. The last fifteen years have witnessed the strange spectacle of sons charging their fathers with rashness; and while the young clung to antiquity, the aged rushed with reckless impetuosity along the road of innovation. The boys of Eton, and the young men of Oxford and Cambridge, were canvassing principles, while their fathers in Parliament were content to deal in shifts and expedients; and though the approbation or disapprobation of schoolboys and undergraduates were derided or despised by Lord Melbourne and Lord John Russell, the young men who assisted in driving the Whigs from power were the striplings of a few short years before. The “Young England” of the House of Commons derives its origin from the Universities. The opinions, sentiments, and aspirations of that section of the House are far too subtle and refined to have originated in that turbulent assembly; they were engendered in a clearer, calmer region—they were first whispered in an esoteric vein, and are now set forth by Mr. Disraeli in the work before us. “To scatter some suggestions that may tend to elevate the tone of public life; to ascertain the true character of political parties; and induce us, for the future, more carefully to distinguish between facts and phrases, reali-

ties and phantoms," is Mr. Disraeli's own exposition of his design in the publication of "*Coningsby*." The medium through which the peculiar views of "*Young England*" are unfolded is a narrative of the career of a youth, of noble birth and high principle, whom the author invests with the old heroic spirit which courts distinction for no selfish gratification, but simply to enlarge the sphere of its beneficence :—

"His was that noble ambition, the highest and the best, that must be born in the heart and organized in the brain, which will not let a man be content unless his intellectual power is recognized by his race, and desires that it should contribute to their welfare. It is the heroic feeling—the feeling that in old days produced demi-gods; without which no state is safe; without which political institutions are meat without salt—the Crown a bauble—the Church an establishment—Parliaments debating clubs—and civilization itself but a fitful and transient dream."

The cool, practical man of business, who punctually exacts the hire for which he believes he has honestly laboured, will smile at the above, as an ebullition of enthusiasm, and the man of forms and tape will pronounce such sentiments visionary; but from this high feeling have noble deeds proceeded, whether Mr. Disraeli and "*Young England*" are too sanguine in their expectations of its revival in this generation or not. That "*Young England*" aspires to do more than it is now possible to accomplish is, we think, too true; but their aspirations are exalted and refined, and we anticipate that good will flow from the agitation of their favourite topics. Their love for Church architecture may be excessive—their desire to restore festival days and old English sports may appear, in the eyes of economists, exceedingly foolish, or even conducive to a culpable waste of time—and their wish to revive the order of the peasantry may be no longer feasible; but in all these sentiments and desires there is an air of nobility, an elegant taste, and kindness of heart. The hard, coarse, matter-of-fact spirit of these days needs a corrective, and we have little fear of its being polished by "*Young England*" into effeminate refinement, or stimulated to lavish generosity. Their errors, we are inclined to think, will be confined to themselves, while their earnestness, we hope, may be beneficially imparted to others. Their fault of youthfulness will inevitably be corrected, and we have little doubt but experience will subdue any excess of zeal, which, after all, is not a fault likely to be imitated by a lukewarm and luxurious generation.

Henry Coningsby is the orphan child of the youngest son of a marquis whom he has mortally offended by his marriage

with an amiable and lovely, but not aristocratic young lady. The peer, by a system of domestic persecution, drives his son to a foreign country, where, with broken health and spirits, he shortly dies. The widow, with her orphan and only child, returns to England and makes an appeal to her husband's father, the wealthiest noble in England, and a man who spared no expense upon his own sensual indulgences, or in costly gifts to those who ministered to his amusement. After urgent and repeated, we may say heart-rending applications, the peer's attorney is sent to the desolate widow with the offer of a small annuity, on condition of her own retirement to a distant provincial town, and the surrender of her son to his grandfather. Desperate necessity, the sense of her own forlorn condition, and a maternal wish, at every sacrifice of self, to advance the interests of her beloved child, made the poor victim yield. But her sufferings were short; she died the same day that her father-in-law was made a marquis. Coningsby was only nine years old when he lost his last parent, from whom he had been then separated for three years. But he remembered the sweetness of his nursery days, his mother's mournful yet tender smile, and bitterly did he weep when his schoolmaster broke to him the tidings of her death. His mother seemed to Coningsby his only link to human society; it was something to write to and talk of his mother, though his prospect of visiting her, as his schoolfellows did their mothers, might be vague and dim. He felt alone, for his grandfather was to him only a name. Lord Monmouth, a calculating, selfish sensualist, resided mostly abroad, and during his rare visits to England felt no inclination to see the orphan of a son whom his unnatural cruelty had destroyed. We will pause to observe that in the character of Lord Monmouth the lineaments of a deceased profligate in high life are readily recognizable by those familiar with society; the same is the case in those of Mr. Rigby, Lord Eskdale, and many others. But our object in reviewing "*Coningsby*" is to notice those portions of it only which develop the gradual formation of the young politician's character and opinions; we leave other contemporaries to cater to an appetite for personal slander or caricature. We much mistake if Mr. Disraeli has not raised up for himself an implacable foe in the literary world by his sketch of Mr. Rigby, and cannot forbear from expressing our opinion that a considerable portion of this personal sketching, clever and amusing though we admit it to be, might have been omitted advantageously to the work, considered as an exposition of seriously entertained principles. Mr. Rigby is represented as that most despicable

of creatures, a profligate aristocrat's dirty tool. The race of the Rigbys is, we hope, materially diminished ; but specimens of the reptiles may still be detected lurking in the vicinage of great houses, whence they yet occasionally crawl up to the benches of the House of Commons. Mr. Rigby, in the exercise of his vocation as Lord Monmouth's man-of-all-work—now watching his patron's interests in a borough, and now ministering to more impure pleasures, or extricating him from the scrapes incident to their indulgence—writes to his lordship in the spring of 1832, when Lord Grey's resignation of office revived the hopes of the Tory party, and draws him from his luxurious retirement in Italy. Lord Monmouth, who, Sybarite though he was, never lacked energy when his own interests were concerned, crossed the Alps and hastened to England. One evening, during a debate in the Lords, a noble duke, whose son had frequently brought young Coningsby home with him to spend his holidays, sat next to Lord Monmouth, and took the opportunity of praising his grandson, and spoke with warmth and favour of his promising qualities.

Lord Monmouth had too much tact to confess that he had never seen that grandson, and therefore confined himself to gracious bows of acknowledgment of the compliment paid a beloved young relative ; but next morning he said to Mr. Rigby, "I should like to see the boy at Eton." Accordingly the ready Rigby posts down to Eton and brings up Coningsby for his first interview with his grandfather. The ardent and affectionate boy, whose memory dwelt on his mother's sweet embrace, and whose heart yearned for a relation's love, contemplated this interview with intense emotion. He is, with much ceremony, at length, ushered through a suite of gorgeous chambers to his grandfather's presence, and received with such frigid stateliness that he bursts into tears. Lord Monmouth, of course, like all sensualists, hates a scene, and Rigby hurries the agitated boy into an adjoining apartment. "My dear young friend (said Mr. Rigby), what is all this?" A sob the only answer. "What can be the matter?" said Mr. Rigby. "I was thinking (said Coningsby) of poor mamma."

Mr. Disraeli writes in strict consonance with historic truth in thus representing his fictitious hero, who is at school foremost in every manly sport, fearless of every danger, and in manhood bold in debate, and inflexible in his adherence to his professed principles, though their maintenance involves the sacrifice of wealth, rank, and even plighted love, as melting into tenderness whenever his memory dwells upon his mother. Let careless or callous fools sneer at the mother's apron-string,

but the pages of history may be ransacked in vain to find a hero who has not confessed his obligations to a mother's teaching, and reciprocated her tenderness; and many a one, in a walk of life far below the heroic, have we seen who, insensible to shame, deaf to the remonstrances of every other monitor, has paused in his criminal career, we hope for his everlasting benefit, when circumstances suggested home and infancy to his mind, and fond memory brought back the image of her who looked upon his childhood.

Coningsby's outburst, which was simply the result of disappointed affection, and did not originate in pusillanimity, induced Lord Monmouth to set down his grandson for a "spoony;" he might peradventure make a parson, but could never move in the same orbit with his patrician grandfather. But, as Mr. Disraeli well remarks, how hardly are the characters of boys deciphered, which all imagine so easy to read.

"How often in the nursery does the genius count as a dunce because he is pensive; while a rattling urchin is invested with almost supernatural qualities because his animal spirits make him impudent and flippant. The schoolboy, above all others, is not the simple being the world imagines. In that young bosom are often stirring passions as strong as our own, desires not less violent, a volition not less supreme. In that young bosom what burning love, what intense ambition, what avarice, what lust of power—envy that fiends might emulate, hate that man might fear."

Coningsby returns to Eton—that "wonderful little world," as Mr. Disraeli aptly designates the school-life, to which all Etonians look back with a fondness unfelt in an equal degree, perhaps, by the pupils of any other of our public institutions. We have heard that Mr. Disraeli is not himself an Etonian; but he draws a vivid and graceful picture not only of the antique spires, the muse's seat, but of a young Etonian's happy buoyant feelings.

"That delicious plain, studded with every creation of graceful culture; hamlet, and hall, and grange; garden, and grove, and park; that castle-palace, grey with glorious ages; those antique spires, hoar with faith and wisdom; the chapel and the college; that river winding through the shady meads; the sunny glade and the solemn avenue; the room in the dame's house where we first order our own breakfast, and first feel we are free; the stirring multitude; the energetic groups; the individual mind that leads, conquers, controls; the emulation and the affection; the noble strife and the tender sentiment; the daring exploit and the dashing scrape; the passion that pervades our life, and breathes in everything, from the aspiring study to the inspiring sport—oh! what can hereafter spur the brain or touch the heart like this—

can give us a world so deeply and variously interesting—a life so full of quick and bright excitement, passed in a scene so fair?"

Coningsby was now passing through the first great epoch of his life, amidst companions who admire and love him, who surround him afterwards at the University, and finally accompany him into the House of Commons. All who know anything of Eton are aware that her boys are sufficiently precocious, both for good and bad ; but Mr. Disraeli has laid the latter portion of Coningsby's time in that establishment in the year 1832, when boys seemed suddenly to peruse newspapers, and discuss the party topics of the day with the zest of veteran politicians. Mr. Disraeli's picture of Coningsby and his Eton companions discussing the probable results of Lord Grey's resignation, in the spring of 1832, and the duke's sudden acceptance of office, contrary, it is now believed, to the sagacious advice of Sir Robert Peel, is true to the life, as all who were careful observers of that busy period may well remember. Middle-aged men affected to smile at these boy politicians, and old men shook their heads and uttered dismal forebodings ; but these boys are many of them now Parliament men, and more are in positions whence their opinions act upon society, and a confession has at length been wrung from many that the fears expressed by boys, in 1832, of their fathers' doings, were well founded.

"The future historian of the country (observes Mr. Disraeli) will be perplexed to ascertain what was the distinct object which the Duke of Wellington proposed to himself in the political manoeuvres of May, 1832. It was known that the passing of the Reform Bill was a condition absolute with the king ; it was unquestionable that the first general election under the new law must ignominiously expel the Anti-Reform Ministry from power, who would then resume their seats on the Opposition benches in both houses with the loss not only of their boroughs, but of that reputation for political consistency which might have been some compensation for the Parliamentary influence of which they had been deprived. It is difficult to recognize, in this premature effort of the Anti-Reform leader to thrust himself again into the conduct of public affairs, any indications of the prescient judgment which might have been expected from such a quarter. It savoured rather of restlessness, than of energy ; and while it proved in its progress not only an ignorance on his part of the public mind, but of the feelings of his own party, it terminated under circumstances which were humiliating to the Crown, and painfully significant of the future position of the House of Lords in the new constitutional scheme.

"The Duke of Wellington has ever been the votary of circumstances. He cares little for causes ; he watches events, rather than seeks to produce them. It is a characteristic of the military mind. Rapid combinations, the result of a quick, vigilant, and comprehensive

glance, are generally triumphant in the field ; but in civil affairs, where results are not immediate—in diplomacy and in the management of deliberative assemblies, where there is much intervening time and many counteracting causes, this velocity of decision, this fitful and precipitate action, is often productive of considerable embarrassment, and sometimes of terrible discomfiture. It is remarkable that men celebrated for military prudence are often found to be headstrong statesmen. A great general in civil life is frequently and strangely the creature of impulse—influenced in his political movements by the last snatch of information, and often the creature of the last aide-de-camp who has his ear."

This is a bold sketch of a living public character, by an author who does not conceal his name ; but we fully expect that posterity will ratify Mr. Disraeli's drawback from the iron duke's acknowledged abilities and conduct as a statesman. We regard the illustrious duke with the highest admiration of his many rare qualities, in civil as well as military life, but we will not ascribe to him infallibility, as many of his flatterers now insist upon doing, with a blind devotion similar and not second to the hero-worshippers of heathendom. Mr. Disraeli may well avow his difficulty in comprehending the distinct object of the duke in his attempt to form an administration in 1832, for its abrupt dissolution showed how immature was its concoction. On the 9th of May, Lord Lyndhurst first went to the king, and on the 15th all was over. The Duke of Wellington, representing the House of Lords, pledged his utmost efforts to relieve the king from the "difficulty and distress," to quote the duke's own report of his sovereign's appeal to himself, and after five days' exertion this man of indomitable will and invincible fortunes retires in discomfiture and despair, assigning for his only reason that the House of Commons had come to a vote which ran counter to the contemplated exercise of the prerogative. From that moment power passed from the House of Lords to another assembly ; in less than a fortnight's time, the peers having abdicated their functions by absence, the Reform Bill passed ; and William IV., who, a few short months before, had declared his readiness to go down in a hackney coach to assist its progress, now declined giving his personal attendance in Parliament to express the royal assent to its provisions. This important revolution, and such in fact and in truth it was, passed at last in a manner so tranquil that the victims themselves were scarcely conscious of the catastrophe. Mr. Disraeli seems to think that then was overthrown that constitution which, modelled on the Venetian, had governed England since the accession of the house of Hanover.

“ ‘The cause for which Hampden died in the field, and Sydney on the scaffold (said Coningsby), was the cause of the Venetian republic.’ ‘How, how (said Buckhurst)?’ ‘I repeat it (replied Coningsby), the great object of the Whig leaders in England, from the first movement under Hampden to the last more successful one in 1688, was to establish in England a high aristocratic republic on the model of the Venetian, then the study and admiration of all speculative politicians. Read Harrington, turn over Algernon Sydney, and you will see how the minds of the English leaders in the seventeenth century were saturated with the Venetian type; and they at length succeeded. William III. found them out in an instant. He told the Whig leaders, ‘I will not be a doge;’ he balanced parties; he baffled them as the puritans baffled them fifty years before. The reign of Anne was a struggle between the Venetian and the English systems. Two great Whig nobles, Argyle and Somerset, worthy of seats in the Council of Ten, forced their sovereign on her death-bed to change the ministry. They accomplished their object; they brought in a new family on their own terms. George I. was a doge; George II. was a doge; they were what William III., a great man, would not be. George III. tried not to be a doge, but it was impossible materially to resist the deeply laid combination. He might get rid of the Whig magnificoes, but he could not rid himself of the Venetian constitution; and a Venetian constitution did govern England from the accession of the house of Hanover until 1832.”

Coningsby goes on to caution his companions against retaining Venetian principles of government now that the Venetian constitution had been destroyed; and manifold as he admits the political perplexities of the times to be, exhorts his young friends, panting for immediate action, to

“Wait and see whether, with patience, energy, honour, and Christian faith, and a desire to look to the national welfare, and not to sectional and limited interests—whether, I say, we may not discover some great principles to guide us, to which we may adhere, and which, then, if true, will ultimately guide and control others.”

There is ardour in these aspirations—there is the fresh spirit of youth spread over these political views, but our soberest readers must admit the mixture of more cool judgment and patience, content to abide its time, than they have heretofore probably attributed to “Young England.” Certainly nothing could be more perplexed on political subjects than were men’s minds in 1832, nor less satisfactory than the solutions offered for the puzzling problems then given forth in shoals for public discussion. There was an eager struggle for place, but feeble strivings for the attainment of principles. The prominent idea of the Tadpoles and the Tapers, who were content to drive the quill and tie up papers in Downing-street or Whitehall, indifferently under either Lord John or Sir James, so that they received their 1,200*l.* per annum, payable quarterly, *et*

tout pour la tripe—their idea of the necessities of the age was, that they themselves should be in office. “The time has gone by (said Mr. Tadpole) for Tory Governments; what the country requires is a sound Conservative Government.” “A sound Conservative Government (said Taper, musingly)—I understand—Tory men and Whig measures.” And the question, What are Conservative principles? is a puzzling one still, notwithstanding the protracted discussions which have been held, for the avowed purpose of expounding their character, aim, and objects. What are Conservative principles? Canadian timber merchants, West India planters, and English farmers return different definitions, but all tend to demonstrate that, in the minds of the several respondents, Conservative principles involve no higher consideration than the perpetuation of certain fiscal arrangements. Attempts were undoubtedly made, shortly after the duke’s failure in 1832, to construct a party without principles. The abettors of such a scheme were actuated by an infinite variety of motives—some laudable, some barely venial, many selfish and base. The ex-treasury clerk wanted to resume his seat and salary; the timid wished to conciliate, and was ready to resign almost anything for the sake of peace; and the cunning and miserly thought to secure the bulk of their possessions by the surrender of a part. It is impossible to deny that the Tamworth manifesto of 1834 was an attempt, a laudable one we will admit, to effect a confederation, to encourage the timid and confused, to satisfy and conciliate the discontented and disaffected. Ten years have rolled away since Sir Robert Peel sent forth that carefully prepared document; and are men more clear in their perceptions of the real distinctive character of Conservative principles in this instant year of grace, 1844, than they were in the autumn of 1834? Without asking any one to point out the broad and palpable distinction, which we presume exists, between the legislative acts of the Whig Lord John Russell and those of the Conservative Sir Robert Peel, or between the official demeanour and Parliamentary management of Sir James Graham, now he is a Conservative Secretary of State, and the course pursued by him when he was a Whig First Lord of the Admiralty, we will quote Mr. Disraeli’s statement of “Young England’s” views of Conservative principles:—

“There was, indeed, a considerable shouting about what they called Conservative principles; but the awkward question naturally arose, what will you conserve? The prerogatives of the Crown, provided they are not exercised; the independence of the House of Lords, provided it is not asserted; the ecclesiastical estate, provided it is regulated

by a commission of laymen. Everything, in short, that is established, as long as it is a phrase, and not a fact.

"In the meantime, while forms and phrases are religiously cherished in order to make the semblance of a creed, the rule of practice is to bend to the passion or combination of the hour. Conservatism assumes, in theory, that everything established should be maintained ; but adopts, in practice, that everything that is established is indefensible. To reconcile this theory and this practice, they produce what they call 'the best bargain ;' some arrangement which has no principle and no purpose, except to obtain a temporary pause of agitation, until the mind of the Conservatives, without a guide and without an aim, distracted, tempted, and bewildered, is prepared for another arrangement, equally statesmanlike with the preceding one.

"Conservatism was an attempt to carry on affairs by substituting the fulfilment of the duties of office for the performance of the functions of government ; and to maintain this negative system by the mere influence of property, reputable private conduct, and what are called good connexions. Conservatism discards prescription, shrinks from principle, disavows progress ; having rejected all respect for antiquity, it offers no redress for the present, and makes no preparation for the future. It is obvious that for a time, under favourable circumstances, such a confederation might succeed ; but it is equally clear, that on the arrival of one of those critical conjunctures that will periodically occur in all states, and which such an unimpassioned system is even calculated ultimately to create, all power of resistance will be wanting ; the barren curse of political infidelity will paralyze all action ; and the Conservative constitution will be discovered to be a *caput mortuum*."

Mr. Disraeli elsewhere calls Conservatism "a barren thing, an unhappy cross-breed, the mule of politics that engenders nothing." This definition is, in the course of his narrative, put into the mouth of an ardent youth, and therefore, to preserve the keeping of the picture, is stronger in its terms than would be consistent with the decorum of practical debate. Alas ! to how many things do we learn, in the stern school of experience, to submit, as inevitable or incorrigible by any means within the compass of our own control, which in early youth we fondly fancied we could either avoid or correct. The objection raised against "Young England" by practical England is—that the former is acute in detecting faults, but suggests no remedy—is fluent in declamation, but unfitted for useful action ; that it is easy to blame the Duke and Sir Robert, but could "Young England" have done better for the country had they been called in and permitted to prescribe for the national diseases in the year 1834, when William IV. sent for a Manchester manufacturer's son from Rome to make him Prime Minister of England ? We think that Mr. Disraeli's estimate of Sir Robert Peel's conduct at this exciting

epoch is candid and fair, and may observe, that he evidently assigns the palm of political prudence and civil judgment to Peel, in preference to Wellington.

"We believe we may venture to assume, that at no period during the movements of 1834-5 did Sir Robert Peel ever believe in the success of his administration. Its mere failure could occasion him little dissatisfaction; he was compensated for it by the noble opportunity afforded to him for the display of those great qualities, both moral and intellectual, which the swaddling-clothes of a routine prosperity had long repressed, but of which his opposition to the Reform Bill had given to the nation a very significant intimation. His brief administration elevated him in public opinion, and even in the eye of Europe; and it is probable that a much longer term of power would not have contributed more to his fame.

"The probable effect of the premature effort of his party on his future position as a Minister was, however, far from being as satisfactory. At the lowest ebb of his political fortunes, it cannot be doubted that Sir Robert Peel looked forward, perhaps through the vista of many years, to a period when the national mind, arrived by reflection and experience at certain conclusions, would seek in him a powerful expositor of its convictions. His time of life permitted him to be tranquil in adversity, and to profit by its salutary uses. He would then have acceded to power as the representative of a creed, instead of being the leader of a confederacy, and he would have been supported by earnest and enduring enthusiasm, instead of by that churlish sufferance which is the result of a supposed balance of advantages in his favour. This is the consequence of the tactics of those short-sighted intriguers who persisted in looking upon a revolution as a mere party struggle, and would not permit the mind of the nation to work through the inevitable phases that awaited it. In 1834, England, though frightened at the reality of Reform, still adhered to its phases;—it was inclined, as practical England, to maintain existing institutions; but, as theoretical England, it was suspicious that they were indefensible.

"No one had arisen, either in Parliament, or the Universities, or the Press, to lead the public mind to the investigation of principles; and not to mistake, in their reformations, the corruption of practice for fundamental ideas. It was this perplexed, ill-informed, jaded, shallow generation, repeating cries which they did not comprehend, and wearied with the endless ebullitions of their own barren conceit, that Sir Robert Peel was summoned to govern. It was from such materials, ample in quantity, but in all spiritual qualities most deficient—with great numbers, largely acried, consoled up to their chins, but without knowledge, genius, thought, truth, or faith, that Sir Robert Peel was to form a 'great Conservative party on a comprehensive basis.' That he did this like a dextrous politician who can deny? Whether he realized those prescient views of a great statesman in which he had doubtless indulged, and in which, though still clogged by the leadership of 1834, he may yet find fame for himself, and salvation for his country, is altogether another question."

Those who were themselves young in years, yet inclined to reflection at the period under consideration, must remember how perplexed and desponding, or callous and desperate, were the immediate actors in the stirring scenes which awakened even boys to earnest enquiry. Some thought that systems would last their time—others, that something would turn up; men of usually grave and calculating character and habits were content to trust to the chapter of accidents. The earnest spirit of ingenuous youth recoiled with disgust and horror from these loose, chance-medley maxims, this avowedly temporizing policy; and, finding no guides among their seniors, turned to their beardless co-evals, to enquire and discuss whether the then state of feeling, in matters civil, political, and religious, were healthy, and whether something definite, deep, and fervent might not be substituted for latitudinarianism and lukewarmness. Mr. Rigby is introduced as answering the eager enquiries of Coningsby, by ascribing every evil to the Reform Bill, and, by way of elucidating his meaning, referring to his own speeches on Schedule A:—

“Then he told Coningsby that want of religious faith was solely occasioned by want of churches; and want of loyalty, by George IV. having shut himself up too much at the cottage in Windsor Park, entirely against the advice of Mr. Rigby. He assured Coningsby that the Church Commission was operating wonders, and that with private benevolence (he had himself subscribed 1,000*l.* for Lord Monmouth) we should soon have churches enough. The great question now was their architecture. Had George IV. lived all would have been right. They would have been built on the model of the Buddhist pagoda. As for loyalty, if the present king went regularly to Ascot races he had no doubt all would go right.”

This may be called satire, but it is a painfully true picture of the sort of answers rendered to youthful enquirers by the routine functionaries of the Liverpool school. What wonder, then, that they should turn from such unsatisfactory instructors and commune with themselves? And this was the case with many (we speak advisedly) whose feelings of veneration were so strong that they would have hung reverentially on every word which fell from the lips of an instructor able to solve their doubts. But when they saw governments hated, religion despised, loyalty departed, and reverence a thing derided, and all their enquiries, as to why these things were so, answered with the evasiveness we may often witness in a museum or gallery, where a clever child puzzles a parent or a nurse by questions which it *will* have answered, what wonder, we say, that young hearts yearned for something warmer in

religion than the court chaplains of the Georgian era preached, and something more sound in political administration than had descended from the Newcastles, the Bubb Doddingtons, and the Walpoles, and been adopted by the Melvilles, the Castle-reaghs, and the Liverpools ? Their convictions might be vague—in some instances we have the best means of knowing they were so—and their hopes might be too sanguine, but their intellects were too much enlightened to remain satisfied with the deficient information which red-tapists could supply, and their hearts too sympathetic with suffering humanity to acquiesce in the cold conclusions of political economy. Many of these young men would recur to the Bible, as furnishing a rule for the conduct of life, and were unwilling any longer to regard it as merely a manual of consolation in the hour of death. They were not content with commissioners' rules and regulations, and sub-commissioners' reports ; and ventured to contend that the order of the peasantry was as ancient, as legal, and constitutionally recognized an order as that of the nobility. All this was a surprise to noble papas, who retained their powder and their pig-tails, and elicited the sneers of clear-headed, cold-blooded elder brothers, who looked upon the Poor Law Amendment Act as another Magna Charta.

“ Henry thinks (said Lord Everingham) that the people are to be fed by dancing round a May-pole.’ ‘ But will the people be more fed because they do not dance round a May-pole ?’ urged Lord Henry. ‘ Obsolete customs !’ said Lord Everingham. ‘ And why should dancing round a May-pole be more obsolete than holding a Chapter of the Garter ?’ asked Lord Henry. The duke, who was a blue-ribbon, felt this as a home-thrust. ‘ I must say (said his grace), that I for one deeply regret that our popular customs have been permitted to fall so into desuetude.’ ‘ The spirit of the age is against such things,’ said Lord Everingham. ‘ And what is the spirit of the age ?’ asked Lord Henry. ‘ The spirit of utility,’ said Lord Everingham. ‘ And you think, then, that ceremony is not useful,’ urged Coningsby mildly. ‘ It depends upon circumstances,’ said Lord Everingham. There are some ceremonies, no doubt, that are very proper, and of course very useful ; but the best thing we can do for the labouring classes is to provide them with work. And what can it signify whether a man be called a labourer or a peasant ?’ ‘ And what can it signify (said Lord Henry) whether a man be called Mr. Howard or Lord Everingham ?’ ”

It is pleasant to look back upon the ancient rural life of England, but its restoration is impossible. The village green on a summer's evening, with its

“ hawthorn shade,

For talking age and whispering lovers made,”

—the squire and the parson, with their stately wives and

smiling daughters, moving among the villagers without any restraint upon their mirth, while they secured their good behaviour, presents a sweet picture of unity and enjoyment over which the imagination revels and the heart glows. But, alas! the picture of ancient English rural life has its reverse; all went joyous as a marriage bell while the lord of the manor smiled, but when his mood was crossed or his passions inflamed, where was cottage peace and purity then? Just so we would remind those who descant so dolefully on the inclosure of commons as destructive of the privileges of the poor, that the dwellers near waste lands are mostly squalid, starved, and slatternly. We need not resort to antiquity, nor travel far for proof of our assertion; an inspection of the commoners on Bagshot Heath and Windsor Forest will suffice. Mark that man, half-thief, half-poacher, stealing, under cover of the night, to fire a royal plantation, because he knows not where to procure fuel to warm himself, and is forbidden to cut a faggot; and say, is the commoners' condition, with all its poetic freedom and vested rights, one worth upholding or extending? But though we think "Young England's" restoration of those festivals and customs which promoted in the olden time a reciprocation of kindly feeling and good offices between the different classes of the community impracticable under the existing circumstances of society, yet would we not treat their arguments on the subject with either derision or disdain. Those arguments are founded on the common possession by all men, whatever their rank, of hopes and fears, desires and aversions, sense of enjoyment and sense of pain, however differently they may express emotions, emanating from one common source. Modern politicians and social reformers are too apt to lose sight of this communion among the children of men. They talk of the PUBLIC, and forget the MAN. They forget that God made man, and endowed him with a nature which may not be altered at a politician's pleasure. Give the labourer employment, he can then earn his bread; and why should he require amusement? Give him food, and what feelings has he to be outraged, though that food be cast to him as to the dogs under the table? So think and act modern economists, in defiance of the apostolical injunction—"Honour *all* men—love the brotherhood." God has commanded us to honour MAN, the work of his own hand, in whatever condition he may be found. The degree and kind of honour will of course differ, but unto honour has every human being a divine title. The criminal and the pauper are men, and for our treatment of them we shall one day have to give an account,

with them, before the tribunal of Christ. But these truths have been lost sight of by rulers who have laboured to govern men on mere material calculations. Their labour has been abortive, and therefore are we glad of that recent recurrence to the Bible and antiquity which has provoked the derision of the sceptical and the earthly—those who doubt the injunctions of the Bible, or look to mere worldly rules for the regulation and government of men. One favourite theory of “Young England” is, that the peril of England is not in the increased feebleness of its institutions, but in the decline of its character as a community. Why is the once cheerful loyal peasant a gloomy rick-burner? “Young England” complains that our rulers have mistaken disorganization for insubordination. Laborious and sturdy men, willing to work, weeping with their wives and children for want of food, and the fires in Suffolk and in the very vicinage of royalty, show that there is something sadly wrong, for the cure of which the remedies hitherto applied have signally failed. Why, then, should we sneer, or frown, or look cold upon those who have a new view of our social evils and their remedies to offer?

Mr. Disraeli charges the party in power at the peace with gross ignorance of the real state of this country; and an impartial posterity will complain of the unsatisfactory adjustment, by the Ministers of that day, of many questions, of both foreign and domestic policy, vitally affecting the interests of England.

“It is always perilous (observes Mr. Disraeli) to adopt expediency as a guide; but the choice may be sometimes imperative. But the Liverpool Cabinet took expediency for their director, when principle would have given them all that expediency ensured, and much more. This Ministry, strong in the confidence of the sovereign, the Parliament, and the people, might, by the courageous promulgation of great historical truths, have gradually formed a public opinion that would have permitted them to organize the Tory party on a broad, a permanent, a national basis. They might have nobly effected a complete settlement of Ireland, which a shattered section of this very Cabinet was forced, a few years after, to do partially, and in an equivocating and equivocal manner. They might have concluded a satisfactory reconstruction of the third estate, without producing that convulsion with which, from its violent fabrication, our social system still vibrates. Lastly, they might have adjusted the rights and properties of our national industries in a manner which would have prevented that fierce and fatal rivalry that is now disturbing every hearth of the united kingdom. We may, therefore (concludes Mr. Disraeli), visit on the backs of this Ministry the introduction of that new principle and power into our constitution which ultimately may absorb all—AGITATION. This Cabinet, then, with so much brilliancy on its surface, is

the real parent of the Roman Catholic Association, the Political Unions, and the Anti-Corn Law League."

Weighty charges these, and propounded in a lofty, not to say arrogant tone ; but we cannot deny that they have a certain foundation of truth to support them. The Ministers referred to were men of routine, who followed precedents without troubling themselves about principle : they went on swimmingly during the excitement and distraction of the war, while the people were too busy to criticize or complain ; but when the peace came, and the stimulating influences which had been acting with concentrated force upon this country suddenly ceased, and they had to survey the social elements heaving and tossing around them, they fell into a panic. " Commerce requested a code ; trade required a currency ; the unfranchised subject solicited his equal privileges ; suffering labour clamoured for its rights ; a new race demanded education."

It certainly required powers of no ordinary kind to meet such emergencies, and unfortunately the Ministers then in place took a single view of these diverse difficulties ; they ascribed all complaints to a spirit of discontent ; they would not recognize the existence of any real grievance ; the Duke of Wellington denied the necessity of any reform ; and they punished, as insurgents, men who were the involuntary victims of the disorganization caused by the disproportionate advance of the material civilization of England in comparison with its moral civilization. In sorrow, but in candour, we must moreover write, that these Ministers, for the most part, looked not heavenwards, but earthwards, for assistance in their difficulties. All their maxims, and schemes, and operations, were worldly ; respectability was religion ; and an assembly, which commences its sittings with the most scriptural liturgy in Christendom, was wont to receive with shouts and laughter any reference to the sacred Scriptures as furnishing any rule of civil polity applicable to modern times. They unconsciously imitated the ignorant and profligate Papist, who only calls for his priest when he believes himself to be dying ; they did not take the Bible as a staff to guide their steps in life, but as a viaticum to pass them comfortably through the portals of death. Religion, to adopt the language of those Erastian men, was an affair between man and his Maker—the Bible was to be read in the closet, and the Prayer Book recited in the church ; but to draw maxims for the guidance of legislators and statesmen from such sources was to be hypocritical or absurd. We prefer the temper of the old naval officer, who, after perusing the lucubrations of an eminent political economist on the mischief

ensuing from a redundant population, confessed himself unable to argue with the sophist on his own grounds, but felt sure that he *must* be wrong, because his doctrines were diametrically opposed to the plain and reiterated declarations of the word of God.

But we must draw our notice of "Coningsby" to a close. We intimated at the outset that it was not our intention to analyze the tale, but to select such portions as might illustrate the peculiar views of "Young England," and indicate the origin of that party. We have not been able to notice all the points we intended, and may perhaps recur to the subject on a future opportunity; for though we are not prepared to "run a muck and tilt at all we meet" in defence of "Young England," as the *Times*, with characteristic vehemence, is doing, we consider the gentlemen constituting that section of public life deserving of more respect than they have received in many quarters. They professedly adopt the Bible as a code whence rules of public policy, and maxims for the regulation of individual conduct, in every conceivable relation of life, may be drawn as safely now as when the inspired penmen had just completed their holy work. This with us covers a multitude of worse faults than any that have been imputed to "Young England." We are not oblivious of the abuse of Scripture phraseology by the Puritans, and deprecate its revival; but it is the pursuance of Bible maxims in act, not the adoption, least of all the puritanic perversion, of its language, which we commend. We ponder frequently in our minds the prophet's symbolical adumbration of the days wherein all things, small as well as great, shall be instrumental in proclaiming God's goodness and glory. "In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, holiness unto the Lord."

Ecclesiastical Report.

THE SEES OF BANGOR AND ST. ASAPH.

GREAT as is our feeling of respect and regard for the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Wellington, and the various members of the Ecclesiastical Commission, by whom the union of these sees was recommended, we cannot but express our most unfeigned gratitude in the decision of the House of Lords against the measure. It appears to us that the main reason with the archbishop and the other members of the Commission was a wish to benefit Manchester. They could not see how

Manchester could have its bishop, unless two of the smaller sees were united. We admit the force of this argument ; and we feel, that at the time when the Commission arrived at their decision, it was even more urgent than at present, inasmuch as there was then a Government by no means favourable to the Anglican Church. Circumstances are now altered ; and we think that Manchester may have its bishop, even though the sees of Bangor and St. Asaph are not united. So strong is the feeling at present in favour of Church extension, that we have no fears on the subject : we are sure that the same people who see the necessity of erecting churches and appointing additional clergymen to populous parishes and districts, will also see the necessity of either reviving the order of suffragan bishops, or of dividing our more extensive dioceses.

Our objection, to the projected union was very strong, but it related more to the mode by which it was proposed to be accomplished, than to the thing itself, abstractedly considered. We hold that such matters are not properly cognizable by Parliamentary authority : they certainly ought to be settled by the Church, in her own ecclesiastical assembly. Were the Convocation to decide that two small dioceses should be united, while another larger one was divided, Churchmen could not complain, because they would be assured that the interests of the Church were consulted. It is not probable, however, that any such decision would be made by Convocation : and we merely suppose a case, in order to illustrate our meaning, which is simply this—that we should be satisfied were the Church herself to adopt any such measure. That no such plan would be entertained we are convinced ; for though our larger dioceses require more bishops, the smallest is quite as much as one individual can superintend.

The House of Lords, then, has decided that no union shall take place—that both Bangor and St. Asaph shall have each its bishop. We are grateful for this decision. The question of Manchester is totally distinct, and must be considered by itself, apart from the union of smaller sees. The funds for the endowment, and the question of the seat in the House of Lords, are the obstacles in the way of an erection of a new bishopric. With respect to the former, we are of opinion that it may be overcome, and that the funds might be provided without difficulty ; and as to the latter, we cannot comprehend why any objection should be made. Were a new bishopric to be created, we apprehend that, as a matter of course—a matter settled by the laws of the land—the bishop would take his seat in the House of Lords. Neither the Lords nor the Commons could

object any more than to the exercise of the royal prerogative in the creation of peers. We are at a loss, therefore, to comprehend the Duke of Wellington's statement, that the introduction of another bishop would effect an organic change in the House of Lords. How so, we ask, any more than the creation of a new peer? In the one case, there is the exercise of the royal prerogative, which is recognized by the laws; in the other, it is only the application of the principle, that the Church is the Church of the nation, which is also recognized by the laws.

The bill introduced by the Earl of Powis repeals so much of the Act of William IV. as relates to the union of the two sees. By that Act it was provided, that the funds derived from the suppressed see should be appropriated to the endowment of a bishopric for Manchester. The funds for the new see must, of course, be derived from other sources.

THE DISSENTERS' CHAPELS BILL.

Among the various measures which have been discussed in Parliament during the present session, perhaps the Dissenters' Chapels Bill has given rise to as wide a diversity of opinion as almost any question of a similar character for a very considerable period. We have had the singular spectacle presented to us of petitions from clergymen and Churchmen against a bill by whose operation Dissenters alone could be affected, while few comparatively of the parties actually interested appear to have been much concerned in the business. The clergy who have petitioned against the bill did so undoubtedly on the ground of the principle involved—the countenance which it appeared to afford to the Socinian heresy; and on this ground alone can their proceedings be justified. Taking an abstract view of the matter, it is a question of little importance to Churchmen whether Dissenting endowments are possessed by one party of Dissenters or another, since the principles of all are opposed, though not equally opposed, to those of the Anglican Church. But we admit that there is some danger in this bill. If the Socinian is favoured by Act of Parliament, we cannot tell how far the *liberalized* feelings of the age may operate in so remodelling our doctrines or our formularies as to admit of Socinians within the pale of the Church. The difference between the *orthodox*, as they are termed, and *Socinian* Dissenters, we believe to be this—the former are sound on the doctrine of the Trinity, while it is rejected by the latter; but the former are also violently opposed to the discipline, ceremonies, and government of the Church of England, while the latter would not be pre-

vented from joining her communion on these grounds, provided her doctrines were modified to suit their views. Socinians have no very fixed views on these subjects, but they would not generally forsake the Church on account of her practices. The Church maintains those great doctrines which they reject; consequently they renounce her communion. Then, again, the Dissenters called *orthodox* object altogether to a Liturgy, or a prescribed form of prayer; but the Socinians, on the contrary, generally use one—so that on the principle itself they do not differ from the Church. The only objection they have to the English Liturgy relates to the doctrines which are embodied in it, and which appear prominently in every part. Nothing, therefore, but doctrinal views prevents a Socinian from joining the Church; and if they are favoured in the matter of endowments, there may be a disposition on the part of our legislators to favour them in other respects,

It appears to us, therefore, that the bill is fraught with mischief—not so much for what it actually does, as for the principle which it involves, and for the precedent which it might furnish. Taking the bill by itself, we view it altogether as a Dissenting measure. We fully concur with the Bishop of Exeter in his protest; but still we cannot agree with some Churchmen, that the Church of England is directly affected by it. In short, the Church could only be affected in some such manner as that which we have pointed out—that is, not directly or immediately, but remotely or by consequence.

We object, however, most strongly to the bill; we object to its principle. We contend that no heresy should be favoured by Parliamentary legislation. Other Dissenters are guilty of schism in causing needless divisions in the Catholic Church; but, in addition to schism, the Socinians are chargeable with heresy. A Christian State never should favour heresy by its legislative enactments; and yet this measure would operate favourably to a party whose heresy is of the most deadly character.

There is another ground on which we object to legislation altogether in such matters. It appears to us to be quite sufficient to leave all such questions to the decision of the law. There may be no positive enactments bearing on questions of this kind; but a court of law will always be able to apply the common principles of justice, and to bring them to bear upon all points at issue among Dissenters, as well as upon questions of a different description. Dissenters are permitted to worship as they please; their friends may endow their chapels, they may establish schools or seminaries; and, in short, every facility is

granted for carrying on their various objects without the necessity of Parliamentary interference. Disputes among them should be left to the operation and decision of the law. In the cases which appear to have originated the bill in question, the law was sufficient, and its enforcement would have given the endowments to the parties for whom they were intended by their founders. This was all that was necessary; but this did not suit the Socinians, who had become possessed of much of that charity which had been intended for those who held the orthodox faith respecting the Trinity. This movement was accordingly got up by that party.

The bill enacts that in all disputes *twenty-five* years' occupancy or possession shall be deemed a sufficient title to the charities attaching to any particular chapel, provided no particular opinions are expressed in the deed of trust. It is a fact, that most of the old Presbyterian chapels, in which the Non-conformists of 1662, and their descendants, worshipped, at length became vested in the hands of Socinians. But how was this change effected? Simply by the congregations gradually becoming Socinian in their views. When such tendencies were entertained, none but a Socinian preacher would suit the people; and at length the whole number, or nearly so, of the old chapels came into the occupation of parties favourable to the Socinian heresy. This bill would, then, confirm many Socinian preachers and congregations in the endowments, which were intended to support opinions which they oppose and condemn. But it should be mentioned, further, that though, some years since, all the older chapels were in the hands of Presbyterians, another change has taken place within the present century, or perhaps within the last few years. It has been stated by most respectable authority, that a considerable number of these old chapels have again come into the occupation of the orthodox Dissenters. The congregations, it seems, have gradually changed, and consequently the Socinian preachers have been removed. As such changes, therefore, are constantly going forward, it is impossible not to see that the bill might operate, in many cases, against the Socinians. Were matters left to the operation of the law, we feel that no difficulty could arise; justice would be done, and no party would have reason to complain.

Then it may be argued, and argued most fairly, that as Dissent is ever changing its character and complexion, it is impossible to decide whether such a bill may not eventually be in favour of the orthodox Dissenters; inasmuch as chapels, with Socinian endowments, may fall into the hands of parties who

hold the doctrine of the Trinity. In reply to this argument, it may be alleged, that it is not usual for Socinians to become orthodox. But facts prove that Socinianism is on the decline; and that the number of their chapels has very considerably diminished during the last quarter of a century. Our position, therefore, is a tenable one, though we do not mean to argue in favour of the bill. On the contrary, we must protest against it, as involving consequences, the evils of which may not be foreseen.

Having expressed our opinion on the character of the measure, we cannot but allude to the changes which Dissenting congregations are perpetually undergoing. In the case of the Church of England no such changes occur. A clergyman may imbibe peculiar notions; but he cannot, unless he be a dishonest man, entertain heretical ones. Then a few years remove him, and a successor is appointed. The articles must be subscribed and the formularies must be used; consequently no material departure from orthodoxy can prevail to any extent, even supposing it to continue for a time; which, however, is not very likely. In the case of Dissenters, all changes commence with the people; they gradually adopt unsound views of doctrine. If the preacher opposes them, they effect his removal; or if a minister is appointed, they elect a man whose opinions accord with their own. Thus, by degrees, the change is completed, and the Trinitarian congregation becomes Socinian. Other changes also occur in a similar way; nor is there anything in Dissent to prevent such melancholy spectacles. These things are of perpetual occurrence among Dissenters: they cannot occur in the Church of England. Why? The reason is obvious—Dissenters have no creed, no articles of faith, no formularies; consequently the will of the congregation is the only standard of appeal. Whatever they choose to maintain must be the law in any particular chapel. In the Church of England such fluctuations are impossible: there are fixed standards—articles of faith to which all must subscribe, and formularies which all must use. The views of the Church, therefore, notwithstanding any opinions which some of the clergy may take up, are always the same; change is out of the question. Or should a particular clergyman be dishonest enough to remain in the Church after adopting unsound notions, the prayers from the desk would proclaim the Church's doctrine, whatever might be proclaimed from the pulpit; and a change of clergymen would always bring things back to their former state. Dissenters, on the contrary, having no such safeguards, are liable to be blown about by every

wind of doctrine. Had the charitable funds, the disposition of which originated the bill, been appropriated to Church of England purposes, no such misapplication could ever have occurred. It is clear that if, a century ago, the Church of England had been displaced from her position in favour of Dissent, Socinianism and Infidelity must have overspread the land.

We cannot quit the present subject without alluding to the conduct of the Dissenting body on this occasion. Though the Wesleyans, and some congregations in England, have petitioned the House of Commons against the bill, the great body of English Dissenters, usually designated the "Three Denominations," have been only partially aroused. Surely these are more concerned than Churchmen can possibly be; and still no movement has emanated from the great mass. We cannot account for so much apathy on their part. But we contrast their conduct on this occasion with their conduct on many others. They are always ready to petition against the Anglican Church—against church-rates, tithes, and all questions affecting our ecclesiastical institutions; but here, in a matter of doctrine so closely affecting themselves, they can almost sit still and allow their Socinian allies to reap the benefit of a bill, against which the Dissenters of a former age would have risen up as one man. What, then, is the inference to be drawn from this apathy on the part of the body of Dissenters? Is it not this—that they themselves are indifferent on the subject; that they are Socinianized in their views; and that they have relinquished the principles of the old Dissenters? We cannot arrive at any other conclusion. Here is a bill which may tend to the support of the Socinian heresy, and vast numbers of Dissenters in England can look on with unconcern. On political subjects, and on all questions connected with the Church of England, they are up in arms in an instant; so that it is clear that they are more interested in politics, and in opposing the Church of England, than in defending one of the fundamental articles of the Christian faith.

MR. BICKERSTETH AND THE SCOTCH SCHISMATICS.

A schismatic is one who causes needless division in the Catholic Church, or who separates without a cause from any particular branch of the Church Catholic. On this ground, therefore, Sir William Dunbar and Mr. Drummond must be guilty of schism in Scotland, since they have separated needlessly from a branch of the Church Catholic, and are now acting on Congregational principles; being subject to no Episcopal control or superintendence, but following their own fancies, just

as Dissenters. That their separation was needless, is proved by the fact, that the Church remains the same; that she had imposed no new terms of communion; and that if they acted right during the period of their connexion with her, they must now of necessity be in error, since the change is not on her part, but on their own. In Scotland, Sir William Dunbar and Mr. Drummond must, on common Church principles, be joined with the Scottish Episcopal Church, or they must be mere Dissenters and schismatics, acting for themselves. To talk of acting on their English orders, as was done in some part of the correspondence between Bishop Terrot and the Church Missionary Association, is absurd and unreasonable; because orders conferred in England cannot qualify any man for acting in a sphere where the authority of an Anglican bishop cannot reach. It is all a fallacy, and the parties must be aware of their position. We are sure that the man who can reject bishops in Scotland, can have no love for them in England; and that he who will not submit where there is no law to compel him, would not yield canonical obedience in England, unless he were compelled. The Churchmanship of such men, therefore, must have been relinquished, or they could never have put forth so unsound a notion as that of acting on English orders in a country where English bishops have no authority whatever.

Viewing the proceedings of Sir William Dunbar as altogether schismatical and most inconsistent, we cannot refrain from an expression of surprise at the recent conduct of Mr. Bickersteth. Had Mr. Baptist Noel been the person, certainly we should have experienced no surprise. We should have looked upon the act, inconsistent as it necessarily is, as quite in accordance with that gentleman's usual practice in connecting himself with irregular persons and irregular proceedings; but we acknowledge that our surprise was great indeed when we found that Mr. Bickersteth was the aggressor.

Our readers have probably perused the correspondence between Bishop Terrot and the Church Missionary Society. In many respects we feel that the society acted with considerable discretion. They would not allow a deputation to preach in Scotland, because they did not wish to take any part in the proceedings relative to the Church and the seceders. It appears that Mr. Bickersteth had pledged himself to the committee, of which Sir William Dunbar was the secretary, to preach in Edinburgh. The bishop very properly appealed to the society in London. They appointed a sub-committee to meet Mr. Bickersteth, to beg him not to preach in Sir William Dunbar's chapel,

and to intimate to that gentleman, that in the event of his persisting in his intention, the committee would be under the necessity of disclaiming the act. Mr. Bickersteth, it appears, requested that a few days might be allowed him for consideration—in fact, that he might consult his friends in Scotland, intimating to the sub-committee, however, that he probably should not give up going to Edinburgh, if the local committee, by whom he had been invited to preach, persisted in their request.

In this part of the business we consider Mr. Bickersteth's conduct to be both unjustifiable and also unfair towards the Church Missionary Society. What right has any private individual to do things which must necessarily implicate a whole society? Whatever may have been his previous services—and we have no wish to call them in question—Mr. Bickersteth ought not to have presumed that he was the society, or that he was at liberty to act contrary to the advice and the earnest entreaty of the committee. To say that he must keep his promise to the Edinburgh committee, unless they released him therefrom, was certainly not the way to heal the breach in Scotland, or to promote the cause of the society in England. The friends of Sir William Dunbar were so far committed to that gentleman's schismatic course that they would naturally rejoice to have Mr. Bickersteth's sanction to his error. Nothing could please them more—it was the very thing they wished. Consequently, when Mr. Bickersteth intimated that he should not comply with the request of the committee in London unless released from his promise by the committee in Edinburgh, he must have known that they would insist upon his going thither. We cannot, therefore, but censure this part of Mr. Bickersteth's conduct: and sure we are that it must be condemned by every sound and consistent Churchman. He ought, if he had been anxious for the cause, not to have regarded a few persons in Edinburgh, whose conduct was such as to call for censure from the Church, but to have even yielded his own views and wishes to those of the committee, who certainly were better judges than he could possibly be of what was proper, under the circumstances of the society. After this first meeting there was no hope that Mr. Bickersteth would desist from his projected course. He certainly evinced anything in his decision but a principle of Churchmanship; for Sir William Dunbar, whatever may be said by lukewarm Churchmen, is in a state of schism, having separated from the only bishop to whom he could possibly pay or render canonical obedience.

Another meeting took place between the sub-committee and

Mr. Bickersteth, when the latter gentleman declared his intention of preaching for Sir William Dunbar, in obedience to the wishes of his Edinburgh friends. The sub-committee then told him that he would act on his own responsibility—as a private person, and not as the representative of the society. So ended the conference between the sub-committee and Mr. Bickersteth. To Scotland accordingly Mr. Bickersteth proceeded; and at the appointed time he made his appearance in Sir William Dunbar's pulpit. All we know of the sermon, or sermons, is from the newspapers, in which it was stated that he expressed his pleasure and satisfaction at being permitted to appear in that pulpit, that he sympathized with Sir W. Dunbar in his present course, and that all he had done met with his approval. On general principles, it matters not what Mr. Bickersteth, or any other individual, may think of Sir William Dunbar's conduct; but it is evident that the latter has more regard for the approbation of the former, than for that of the lawful governors of the Church, to whom, as a Churchman, he is pledged to submit. Mr. Bickersteth, therefore, would act a similar part in Scotland with Sir William Dunbar. Then why not do the same in England? Mr. Bickersteth has not more liberty here than his friend Sir William had in Scotland. Why, then, does Mr. Bickersteth remain within the pale of the Church in this country, when he has distinctly stated that he should separate, were he in Scotland, while no circumstances existed there which do not equally exist here? There is something mysterious in this line of conduct—something, certainly, which we do not understand.

We may put another case to Mr. Bickersteth. An Episcopalian must be subject to Episcopal authority. This point is clear. Sir William Dunbar is subject to no such authority; consequently it is vain and childish to talk of his Church principles or his Episcopal subjection. He has set up a chapel on his own account, just as seceders in England have done. We should like to know, from Mr. Bickersteth, what difference there is between the conduct of Sir William Dunbar, and Mr. Harrington Evans, Mr. Bridgman, Mr. Rees, Mr. Bulteel, or any of those who, within the last few years, have quitted the Anglican Church, and are now preaching in meeting-houses? We ask again, would Mr. Bickersteth venture to preach for any of those gentlemen? Yet what difference is there, as far as principle is concerned, between their conduct and Sir William Dunbar's? We cannot discover any. The latter acts in defiance of the Church and of bishops in Scotland—the former do the same in England; and it strikes us, that the fact that an Anglican bishop

cannot interpose his authority for what his clergy may do in Scotland, should make a clergyman equally observant, in that country, of his conduct, in order that there might not be even room for suspicion. Whatever, therefore, may be said by Mr. Bickersteth's advocates, it cannot be denied that he has been guilty of an act in Scotland which he would not commit in England. He preached in the chapel of a seceder in Scotland—he will not do the same in the diocese of Lincoln or of London; yet the act, irrespective of country, is equally opposed, whether perpetrated in the one or in the other, to the principles of the Catholic Church, and is consequently equally reprehensible.

We admit that the Church Missionary Society are placed in a difficulty, and that they cannot, in ordinary circumstances, interfere with local committees. But the Church must not be injured from any unwillingness on the part of a society to act in cases of difficulty or delicacy. It strikes us that, if Sir William Dunbar persists in his present course, it will be the duty of the society to have no connexion with a committee of which he is the secretary. If they do not cease all connexion with such a man, the society must eventually suffer injury, by the withdrawal of much of that support which is as yet afforded to it. Besides, there is the Propagation Society, so that the friends of missions will not be at any loss for an institution to which they can lend their assistance, and whose objects are the same. Undoubtedly, a considerable number of the present supporters of the society would adhere to it, and even prefer it, were it composed entirely of men of similar views respecting Church principles with Sir William Dunbar and Mr. Bickersteth.

Before we quit this subject, it may not be amiss to notice a line of argument—if, indeed, it can be dignified with the name of argument—adopted by certain persons, whenever an appeal is made to the expressed and authorized sense of the Church of England. It is not uncommon to hear even clergymen, when the Church is mentioned as an arbiter on certain questions of doctrine or practice, allege—*Oh, we go to the Bible—the Bible stands before the Church!* Now it seems that these parties forget that they have subscribed to those views respecting matters which, perhaps, are not fully expressed in the written word, which the Church has herself adopted. Nay, every clergyman has solemnly pledged himself to those views of doctrine, discipline, and practice, which the Church herself holds, and which she has embodied in her various formularies; consequently, no one can adopt opinions of a contrary tendency without compromising his character as a member of that body to which he

belongs. When, therefore, we hear clergymen talk of an appeal to the Bible on those points which the Church has settled, and which they themselves have sworn to be agreeable to the Bible, since the Church decrees nothing contrary to the word of God, we know very well that the parties mean nothing more nor less than some private and previously formed opinions of their own, or rather, certain views of the Scriptures which they themselves have formed. The boast of an appeal to the Bible comes with a bad grace from such persons, since it means only an adherence to a set of peculiar opinions which they choose to consider as their views of the word of God, whereas they may have pledged themselves to directly the contrary. The Church appeals to the Bible. The views of our formularies are those of the Bible—they were those of the Reformers, of the primitive Church, and of the Church Catholic in all ages; but the men who reject the Church, and talk of the Bible, throw discredit on the word of God, by deriving from it opinions which it does not contain, and which, consequently, the Church of England has rejected.

THE REFORMATION SOCIETY.

Of the objects contemplated by the Reformation Society we most cordially approve, though we dissent from the principle of merely taking the ground of opposition to Popery without reference to Churchmen or Dissenters. We hold that, in religious matters, Churchmen and Dissenters cannot unite without a compromise of principle on one side or on the other. It is quite impossible for Churchmen to unite with Dissenters in a Reformation Society, because our discipline, which was a part of the Reformation, is rejected by Dissenters, and is so interwoven with doctrine that the two cannot be separated. It is not, however, our intention to discuss this question on the present occasion; we allude to the subject simply for the purpose of pointing out what we conceive to have been—what shall we say?—an error? no! but an absurdity, in the last report of the Society. In that document the committee of the society allude especially to Oxford, and to the opinions contained in the *Tracts for the Times*. The gentlemen constituting that committee undertake to point out an error in the Oxford system of education. They complain of the impossibility of attending to theological pursuits. They allege, that so much attention is paid to classics and mathematics, that no time can be spared for theology, and they, of course, call for an alteration. It appears that they

attribute the success of the *Tracts for the Times* to this cause. Such is the opinion of the Reformation Society.

Now we do not mean to enter into the abstract question involved in the remarks of the committee—on this point we will only add, that Oxford men, who are the only competent judges, form a very different opinion; but what we wish to remark upon is the singularity of the proceeding. Let it be considered of whom the committee is composed. Who are the society's officers? Generally the officers of a society draw up the report of the society, though the whole committee are responsible for the document. Looking, then, at the officers and the committee of the Reformation Society (and we have the highest respect for these gentlemen), will it be admitted that they are competent judges of such a question, or that they are in a position to give advice to a University? We apprehend but one answer from all who understand the matter. Sure we are that they would at once concur with us, that the committee are necessarily disqualified from entering upon such a question. Are the members acquainted with the University of Oxford? Or, if they were members, would they be able to decide a question of such importance? At all events, can it be disposed of in a small report? Looking at the question itself, and taking into the account the character of the committee, we cannot but think that the proceeding on the part of the society is truly ridiculous. It cannot recommend the cause with sound Churchmen, though it may do so with some of those inconsistent persons whose zeal against the *Tracts* has actually eaten up their Churchmanship. The Reformation Society may oppose the *Tracts* and their authors, but they have no right to make reflections on the Oxford system of education, of which they know nothing positively as a committee, even if one individual of the body should be a member of that University. Supposing the evil to exist, which we strenuously deny, we should say that such a body as the committee of the Reformation Society are not the proper persons to apply a remedy. Their ignorance of the peculiar circumstances of the case disqualifies them from giving an opinion. In all other matters it would be thought very absurd for persons to offer an opinion on questions with which they must of necessity be unacquainted. Why, then, should a few gentlemen in London presume to interfere in such a matter? They are quite as competent (yea, far more so) to reform the army or the navy, as to effect a change in the system of education adopted in that University.

SCRIPTURE READERS.

Our readers are already aware of an association, patronized by the Bishops of London and Winchester, for supplying *lay readers* to the various populous parishes in London and its vicinity, within their lordships' dioceses. The principle of lay agency is one to which, except under peculiar circumstances, we have a most decided objection. In almost every case its adoption has led to innumerable evils. We make an exception, however, in favour of this society. Usually the lay agents are entirely under the control of a lay committee. Were they even under the direction and management of the clergy we should object, because we hold that the clergy cannot lawfully and properly act in such matters on their own responsibility, irrespective of their bishop. In the present case no such unlawful authority is exercised. The bishops in whose dioceses the lay agents are to be employed are the sole directors of the scheme; and under such circumstances our objections do not hold good. We are sure that the Bishops of London and Winchester will break up the society and abolish the agency, if, on trial, it should be found that confusion or mischief should ensue. Under such control, however, we do not anticipate any evil, and we heartily wish success to the efforts of the society. Of course it will be necessary for the bishops to act, and sometimes they may find it difficult to please the committee; but still we are convinced that they will act with firmness and decision. That something must be done for the populous parishes of this metropolis and its vicinity is obvious, unless the people are to relapse into Dissent or indifference; since it is utterly impossible for the clergy to superintend their overburdened parishes.

The office of these Scripture readers will, we conceive, be defined. They will be instructed in what they are to do, and also in what they are to avoid. Their duties, indeed, are implied in the very designation—Scripture readers. They are not to expound the Bible—not to preach—not to assume the ministerial office—but simply to read the written word to those who are destitute of saving knowledge. They will be useful to the clergy also, for they will be able to get statistical accounts of their various districts, and to point out those cases which especially need ministerial assistance.

Though, therefore, we object to lay agency in general, disapproving, as we do, of much of the working of certain societies by which it is employed, yet we cannot but wish success to the present undertaking. The character of the two prelates is a sufficient guarantee that no irregular proceedings will be per-

mitted; while the constitution of the society, which vests all authority in the bishops, is free from those objections to which we have previously alluded, and which mark the actions of some other institutions, to which even some clergymen, inconsistently as we think, lend their support.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S PASTORAL LETTER.

We rejoice to find that the call of the Bishop of London has been so liberally answered by the clergy and laity of this populous diocese, so that *thirty-eight* new churches are either already consecrated or are advancing towards consecration, while ten others will be commenced as soon as proper sites can be conveyed for the purpose. This is a glorious commencement of a great undertaking, which we trust may be completed by his lordship. Last year the call was responded to by the diocese in general. We have not yet heard the amount contributed this year; but we do not doubt that it will equal the expectations of the bishop. The collection was made on the 9th of June, and we conclude that it was made in every church. Last year the mode of collecting was cavilled at by some of those persons who "strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel," and who are always ready to exult molehills into mountains. They could not endure that the money should be collected as the rubric directs. And why were they so sensitive on such a point? The only reason assigned was, that the *Tracts for the Times* commended the practice. On this sole ground some of the clergy, aided by certain of the laity, who oppose everything which does not coincide with their own party views, were inclined to condemn the mode as an innovation. The Bishop of London recommended the practice as a restoration. His lordship would sanction no innovations; yet much reproach was heaped upon him for his previous letter; and we are not sure that certain unbecoming remonstrances were not addressed to him by persons who had no right whatever to interfere in such matters.

Knowing what had occurred last year, and wishing that his lordship might not be deterred from his course by clamour, we were much gratified to find him, in his recent letter, adhering to his former recommendation, and directing the people to the reasons there assigned for the restoration of a practice which never ought to have been permitted to fall into disuse. His lordship refers to his previous letter, without specifying particulars; but he distinctly states that he sees no reason whatever for altering his opinions. Nay, he states that he is confirmed in his previously expressed views, and he hopes that both clergy and laity will see the propriety of the plan which

he recommends. When we consider that the practice is that of the Church; that it had fallen into disuse through the neglect of the clergy of a former age, and not in consequence of their zeal against Popery, or any other erroneous system; that its revival, so far from being an innovation, is only a restoration, we cannot imagine that any Churchman can possibly raise objections to the mode of making the collection. Surely there are many things practised by the Tractarians which are good and lawful, and which may be adopted by all persons indiscriminately, without subjecting themselves to the charge of reviving Popish practices. The Tractarians wore shoes, like other men; shall we, therefore, discard them as useless, or as Popish? This would not be more absurd, than to object to the mode of collection recommended by the Bishop of London. We trust, therefore, that we shall hear no more of the silly talk of the impropriety of resorting to a practice because it has been adopted by the Tractarians. If these gentlemen revive the practices of the Church, let us be thankful, and follow the example. At all events, let us not be deterred by the clamours of a few disaffected Churchmen from complying with the practices of the Church—practices to which all the clergy have solemnly pledged themselves.

The pastoral letter of the Bishop of London proves—if, indeed, any one could entertain a doubt on the subject—that Dissent is in as low a state in the metropolis as in the provinces. Sometimes we are told that Churchmen are a minority of the country; yet we find that churches are raised in every quarter—that large sums are readily procured for their erection—and still further, that, as soon as they are opened for public worship, they are attended by crowded congregations. Until the Church roused herself, many persons were inclined to credit the assertions of Dissenters; and we verily believe that the falsehoods so unblushingly put forth respecting numbers were the very cause of those exertions which, during the last ten or fifteen years, have been so successfully made in every part of the kingdom. So that we have reason to be thankful that the infatuation of Dissenters led them to imagine that they could overawe and put down the Church of England.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS BILL.

Mr. Thomas Slingsby Duncombe has prophesied the entire destruction of the ecclesiastical courts! The prophecy may indeed be accomplished, but certainly the honourable member will not live to see the verification of his prediction. Mr. Roebuck objects to the phraseology employed by these courts

in their formal documents, especially does he object to the expression, "*the health of the soul.*" The honourable gentleman seems to have a special objection to this expression. He cannot endure to think that his soul should be cared for by any one. We hope that the honourable member may commit the keeping of his soul to that gracious Being who alone can care for it; but we cannot refrain from reminding him that language not dissimilar is used by the criminal law in its formal documents. Why, then, should an objection be raised to words? In all our old forms, whether legal, or parliamentary, or ecclesiastical, language is employed which in modern times would not have been adopted; but we really cannot see why any objection should be raised, since no evil, or even inconvenience, is experienced by any person. At any rate, the ecclesiastical forms are not more singular than the others to which we have referred; and surely the one may be permitted to remain as well as the rest. We see, indeed, no substantial objection to an alteration in the phraseology employed, beyond that which we entertain against any change for the mere sake of change; but we must protest against the application of a principle to ecclesiastical courts which is not to be applied to our courts of criminal and common law. It is clear, however, that Mr. Duncombe and Mr. Roebuck are opposed to the ecclesiastical courts because of their connexion with the Church of England, which is so much the object of their hatred. They would abolish the ecclesiastical courts—they would also abolish the Church of England. In neither case will their desires be accomplished.

We have, on previous occasions, expressed our decided opposition to change for the mere sake of change; but to certain improvements in the administration of the ecclesiastical law no sound Churchman can object. The former bill was far too sweeping in its enactments: the present is free from this evil, and therefore we regard it as an improvement. Some changes are indeed made; but still we cannot but view the measure as beneficial.

It was remarked, in the course of the debate in the House of Commons, that the business of these courts could not be transacted in the courts of common law. We are certain that the evils of such a transfer would be far greater than any which exist under the present system. The business of these courts is peculiar, and the judges and the advocates are trained in such a manner as to qualify them for its due and proper discharge. We should, therefore, regard the abolition of these courts as an evil of no small magnitude—an evil, the consequences of which would be experienced in future generations.

Notwithstanding the sneers of Mr. Duncombe and Mr. Roebuck, we feel assured that a British Parliament will not hastily and heedlessly destroy a structure reared by our forefathers, and which has operated, through a succession of ages, for the benefit of the country.

The bill need not be analyzed. Its enactments are simple and calculated to be productive of good. Churchmen appear in general to be satisfied: and Dissenters are not concerned in the matter. They have no right to complain of a measure which does not concern them; yet they will not abstain from interference. It is singular, too, that all the opponents of the Church unite on such questions. Papists, Dissenters, Radicals, Infidels, with all sorts of schismatics, unite in one common bond against the Church, and all measures by which her interests are affected.

CHURCH SOCIETIES.

The various societies connected with the Church of England are in a flourishing condition, as the reports recently published testify. We do not, however, intend to enter into particulars respecting these societies: we shall merely allude to *one*, and that only for the sake of noticing a statement which has again and again been made, respecting the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. It was stated, in a quarter not remarkable for acknowledging errors, that improper persons were employed by the Society in India; that the Society ought not to be supported in consequence; and that *the Colonial Church Society*, as it chooses to designate itself, was rather entitled to the confidence of those who had a regard for the truth. These things were put forth on the authority of persons in India—laymen, who, as is now proved, were disposed to view everything as *Tractarian* which was merely in conformity with the rubrics and canons, if it happened not to suit the inclinations of these unauthorized and self-constituted judges. We stated at the time that a little space would explain all—we affirmed our conviction that there was no truth in the statement. The event proved the correctness of our views; for the Bishop of Calcutta, speaking of one of the parties so unjustly traduced, assured the public that a more zealous and excellent man could not be found in India. His lordship alluded to the evil rumours which had been communicated from that country for circulation in this; yet the propagators of the reports never uttered one word in acknowledgment of their error. From the time when the false reports originated, to the present moment, no retraction has been made. In our opinion, it is not only the part of

Christians, but of honest men, to confess an error, regardless of consequences to reputation for accuracy or veracity; but the parties who slandered the Propagation Society have hitherto maintained a perfect silence, though, had their assertions been verified, they would have trumpeted abroad their own sagacity in discovering and pointing out what was going on in India. The truth is, the Propagation Society is well managed, both at home and abroad; it is conducted on Church principles—a circumstance not much calculated to recommend it to certain parties, though they call themselves Churchmen; and its usefulness is so great, that the crippling of its efforts would be a calamity of no ordinary kind. We rejoice in its prosperity; and sure we are that, notwithstanding the recommendations from certain quarters to support the Colonial Church Society, as it is most improperly designated, all sound Churchmen will continue, as far as their means will permit, to render it their most efficient and continual assistance. It appears strange that even success is complained of by some persons, unless it arises in their own way. They would venture almost to dictate to the Providence of Almighty God the mode in which its great works should be accomplished.

General Literature.

The Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the Church of Rome contrary to Holy Scripture, and to the Faith and Practice of the Church of Christ through the First Five Centuries. By J. E. TYLER, B.D., Rector of St. Giles. London: Bentley. 1844.

THIS treatise, dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury, at whose desire it has been published, has two objects in view—first, whether that which is alleged against Rome, concerning the worship of the Virgin Mary, does in very deed exist in her and belong to her; and in the next place, whether that, whatsoever it be, is so contrary to the doctrine of our Saviour and his apostles, and so inconsistent with the teaching and practice of the Church in her earliest and purest ages, as to require a separation from communion with her.

“These two points it is the main object of the present treatise to ascertain and establish.” (*Introduction*, xiii.)

VOL. XVI.—P

"With humble confidence the author would invite all who call themselves Christians to examine and sift the evidence, and to try the momentous question for themselves ; the issue joined between the two Churches (of England and Rome) being this—whether the worship of the blessed Virgin Mary in the Church of Rome be not contrary to the teaching of holy Scripture, and to the faith and practice of the Church of Christ for five hundred years and more." (xv.)

"Our Church, in her liturgy, her homilies, her articles, and in the works of her standard divines and most approved teachers, ever speaks of St. Mary, the blessed Virgin, in the language of reverence, affection, and gratitude. She was a holy virgin and a holy mother, highly favoured, blessed among women. The Lord was with her, and she was the earthly parent of the only Saviour of mankind. She was herself blessed, and blessed was the fruit of her womb. Should any one entertain a wish to interrupt the testimony of every succeeding age, and to check the continuous fulfilment of her own prophecy, 'all generations shall call me blessed,' the Church of England would not acknowledge that wish to be the legitimate and genuine desire of one of her own members."

"But when we are required either to address our supplications to the Virgin Mary and to offer prayers to God through her mediation and intercession, or else to protest against the errors of our fellow Christians who adhere to the faith and practice of Rome in this respect, we have no ground for hesitation—the case offers no alternative: our love of unity must yield to our love of truth. We cannot join in that worship which in our conscience we believe to give to a mortal a share, at least, of the honour due to God alone, and to exalt the Virgin Mary into that office of mediation, advocacy, and intercession between God and man, which the written word of inspiration and the primitive Church have taught us to ascribe exclusively to that divine Saviour who was God of the substance of his Father, begotten before the worlds; and Man of the substance of his mother, born in the world." (xxii.)

The plan pursued by Mr. Tyler is, first, to show what the present authorized and enjoined worship of the Virgin is, as deduced from the Roman Missals and Breviary. And this is ample testimony to establish the first point contended for, in the minds of all who consider what public prayer ever has been, and that there can be only one being capable of receiving such homage—GOD ALONE. But Mr. Tyler proceeds, in his second chapter, to show the extraordinary excess to which the idolatry of the Virgin has been carried by various individuals of high name in the Roman Church—many of them afterwards canonized—and this not only unchecked, but applauded and sanctioned by the Papal authorities; which authorities, therefore, have committed *their Church* to the adoption of these excesses, and Rome must be held responsible for the doctrines of Bonaventura and these other individuals, in having given her express sanction to

these very writings. Bonaventura's parodies on the Psalms, the *Te Deum*, and the Athanasian creed, are among the most blasphemous things that have ever been written; the phrase "our Lady" being substituted for Jehovah throughout the Psalms, as—"In thee, *O Lady*, have I trusted; let me not be confounded"—"Into thy hands, *O Lady*, I commend my spirit"—"Let *Mary* arise, and let her enemies be scattered," &c.

"The *Te Deum* is thus miserably distorted—'We praise thee, mother of God; we acknowledge thee, *Mary the Virgin*,' " &c. (32).

"The Athanasian creed is employed in the same manner—'Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold firm the faith concerning the *Virgin Mary*,' " &c. (33).

All of which mockeries of worship and insults to common sense have been continued by sundry canonized saints enumerated by Mr. Tyler, closing with Theophilus Raynaud, the Jesuit, 1665, who, in extravagance, carries these monstrous parodies to the most disgusting length. Mr. Tyler justly observes, that a man must have lost all reverence even for the word of God, as well as for God himself, before he could think of applying to Mary the very words consecrated by the Holy Spirit to the worship of the supreme and only God; and that the practical effect likewise is, to make God an object of aversion, rather than love, when he is thought upon at all.

"The fact is, that the direct tendency of the worship of the Virgin, as practically illustrated in the Church of Rome, is to make the Almighty himself an object of fear, and the Virgin an object of love..... as the moderator of Jehovah's justice and the appeaser of his wrath—such as, 'Compel thy Son to have pity. Calm the rage of thy heavenly husband; let his heart be softened towards us.' If any one feels himself aggrieved by the justice of God, he may appeal to Mary. 'God is a God of vengeance; but thou, Mary, dost incline to be merciful.' Surely these are expressions conveying sentiments and associations shocking to our feelings, and from which our reason turns away, as we think of God's perfections, and the full atonement and all-powerful intercession of his Son, Christ our Redeemer." (37).

These things are enough to satisfy the generality of readers, and to render a further enquiry unnecessary. But Mr. Tyler pursues the subject, like a theologian and a scholar, through the holy Scriptures and the history of the early Church; and he shows that as long, as purity of faith and doctrine continued, no traces of such worship can be found, as no words which can possibly justify it exist in Scripture or any confessions of the Church. And many theologians and scholars will be glad to accompany Mr. Tyler in these investigations, which are conducted throughout with much candour, as well as learning and orthodoxy. And not the least interesting part will be the Ap-

pendix, in which notice is taken of the "reckless manner in which supposititious works have been ascribed to the saints and most esteemed writers of the primitive Church." And Mr. Tyler might also have added, the reckless manner in which their genuine works are set aside to serve a particular purpose. Some good observations are accordingly made on the writings of most of those who have been referred to in the body of the book, distinguishing the genuine from the spurious.

Reppendune : a Moral Rhyme. By the Rev. J. JONES, M.A.
Derby. 1844.

THIS is a small, unpretending volume—one of the many that have been summoned forth by an awakened interest in the noble works and pious munificence of our forefathers. "Reppendune" is the ancient name of Repton, a place celebrated for its ecclesiastical antiquities, and is a sort of connecting link among the poems. Some of them illustrate the old legends yet current about the hermit Guthlac, and the deposed Burhred, the Boabdil of the Mercian dynasty. Hence, as we may suppose, the poems are all more or less steeped in the thoughtfulness that arises necessarily from a love of ecclesiastical antiquity. Mr. Jones states, in his preface, that his productions are to be looked upon as the employment of hours of relaxation, and are not intended as poems, so much as rhymes. This is a sensible preface, and misleads nobody; we know what to expect, and we read the book, or pass it by, according to our individual tastes. It is upon those books which pretend to contain poetry, and do not even exhibit connected prose, that we make, and will continue to make, our perpetual warfare. Mr. Jones only attempts a simple, unaffected style, and, in consequence, is very intelligible, and, to us, very agreeable.

The poem on Anchor Church is as good as any in the volume. Anchor Church, we are informed, is an excavated rock, whose base was in former times washed by the Trent, and was supposed to have been the seat of an anchorite, whence it derives its somewhat curious appellation. The apostrophe to the anchorite, and the speculations upon his destiny, are somewhat tedious, as they occupy fourteen or fifteen pages; otherwise we should have very little fault to find with the poem. The sentiments are just, definite, and seem entirely free from all that clap-trap hankering after outworn usages which mars the usefulness of many a learned and instructive work upon ecclesiastical antiquity. Mr. Jones is a good man and true, and shall speak for himself—

"Ah, lady! I have kept thee long

A listener to my wandering song :

But think not thou, that I desire
 Those times unduly to admire,
 And say—the splenetic to please—
 Past times were better far than these.
 O deem not this a puling rhyme,
 That celebrates the “good old time:”
 Since I maintain—what thinkest thou?—
 Days ne’er excelled what days are now.
 ’Tis true, the world is bad enough,
 Our pathway through it rude and rough,
 And pride and folly widely reign,
 Deforming with polluting stain
 The polish’d town and rural plain.
 Yes, there is cause for grief; but still,
 Each may be better if he will.”

“Askew Hill” and “The Trent” next succeed. They are both of the same character—simple outpourings of thoughts suggested by the scenery. The verses are fully and entirely of the character they profess to be; they are of no high æsthetic order; they do not attempt to startle or surprise us, but run onwards smoothly and silently, bearing many a sound lesson and many a thoughtful sentiment. Mr. Jones has quite won our heart by the loving way he speaks of the remains of bygone days; he has no cold sneer for the simple piety of our forefathers, but seems, throughout these poems, to desire to recall to his mind the thoughts and deeds of those whose names yet live among the traditions of “Reppendune.”

“And now I see the holy well—
 Its waters taste—and long to tell
 Of those who oft, in days of yore,
 To this sweet spot their pitchers bore,
 And loved to see the fountain pour,
 In gentle form, its sparkling stream;
 Loved there, in evening’s mellow beam,
 With pensive hearts to muse and dream;
 Or now their sweetest anthems sung,
 While o’er the fount the ash-tree flung
 Its grateful shade in which they rest,
 The calm, the lonely, and the blest.”

“The Church” is of the same character; it contains musings upon the ancient fabric before the writer’s eyes, and thence diverges into some few reflections upon the vicissitudes of the Catholic Church of Christ. We shall not dwell upon the “Miscellaneous Rhymes,” as it would not be just to dissect or criticize what the author himself has stated belong rather to a monitory, than a poetic style. Some are, however, not only effective, but of simple and graceful structure. “The Elm of

Ingleby" and "'Tis the Music" are very happy instances. In the rhyme entitled "The Author," we poor reviewers come in for a little good-natured abuse:—

"This secret censor—who can guide his pen?—
Scatters his treacle, vinegar, cayenne,
Just as he pleases, scorning all control—
Extols a part: alas! condemns a whole.
How ends the matter?"

Why thus, Mr. Jones—that we will give you neither treacle, vinegar, or cayenne, but just and deserved praise. What you have attempted, you have done, and done well, and we heartily wish you success in your simple and unostentatious course.

The Wooden Walls of England in Danger: a Defence of Church Pews. London: Ridgway. 1844.

THIS pamphlet is directed against a feeling which we sincerely hope may soon become general, namely, the feeling in favour of open and free seats in our churches. Pews are an innovation, consequently the title of the pamphlet would have been more appropriately applied to open seats—they are more like the *wooden walls of England*. We have no sympathy with the author; he is no friend to the clergy, and, consequently, can have but little love for the Church. But, notwithstanding his ridicule, we have no fears for the result. The feeling in favour of open seats is on the increase, and we feel assured that it will continue to advance.

The Sabbath Companion; being Essays on First Principles of Christian Faith and Practice; designed especially for the Use of Young Persons. By THOMAS DALE, M.A., Canon of St. Paul's and Vicar of St. Bride's. London: Bowdery and Kirby.

THIS is a very useful work, and the name of its author warrants as much. It is designed for the use of young persons whose time is much engaged during the week by their secular pursuits and occupations, and who are the more desirous on that account to redeem a portion of the Lord's-day for religious reading. The volume supplies much material for mental thought after perusal; and, we must add, if fault may be found with it, it is only on the score of the papers being, really, as of much importance to the aged and experienced Christian, as to the youthful disciple. This, it will be seen, is hardly finding fault; but our real meaning is, that the articles are scarcely simple enough for the capacities of young people; but they are full of truth and beauty, and so may God speed them!

Delineation of Roman Catholicism; drawn from the authentic and acknowledged Standards of the Church of Rome; namely, her Creeds, Catechisms, Decisions of Councils, Papal Bulls, Roman Catholic Writers, the Records of History, &c.; in which the peculiar Doctrines, Morals, and Usages of the Church of Rome are stated, treated at large, and confuted. By the REV. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D. A New Edition, corrected and revised throughout; with numerous important Additions. By the REV. JOHN STAMP. London: Mason.

THE Popish controversy which had been revived during the latter part of the reign of Charles II., in the anticipated succession of a Papist to the British throne, was carried on with great ability, on the part of the Protestants, during the reign of James II., whose conduct, subsequent to his coronation, was one continued violation of his coronation oath. In this controversy the divines of the Church of England bore a prominent part, and their writings constitute one of the noblest monuments of talent, learning, and piety, which any Church has ever erected in any one generation of its history. Besides many large treatises, in which particular subjects of controversy are most elaborately discussed—we might say, exhausted—an immense number of smaller discourses were published, in which every topic, bearing upon the point in dispute, was elucidated with great success. Most of these were afterwards collected together, digested under appropriate titles, and published by the learned and zealous Bishop of London (Dr. Gibson), in the year 1788, in three large folio volumes, with copious indexes, under the title of “A Preservative against Popery, in several select discourses upon the principal heads of Controversy between Protestants and Papists; written and published by the most eminent Divines of the Church of England, chiefly of the reign of King James II.” This collection of treatises is a complete storehouse of most valuable materials on every branch of the Romish controversy; but, unhappily, its rarity, and consequent high price, render it all but inaccessible to those who may necessarily be engaged in polemical discussion with Papists. Various little manuals, indeed, treating on particular subjects, have been published of late years; but a comprehensive general treatise on the *whole* of the points at issue between Protestants and Papists was a desideratum in our theological literature. That desideratum is now supplied by Dr. Elliott, the transatlantic author of the truly valuable “Delineation of Roman Catholicism,” which we now have the pleasure of introducing to our readers, and which was published at New York in 1842, in two thick octavo volumes, containing upwards of nine hundred and eighty pages.

The author states that this work is the result of more than twenty years' labour. Believing that the system of Popery is at variance with and injurious to true religion, and (if unchecked) will overturn the religious liberties of the United States, he has published his "Delineation" in order to disabuse the public mind respecting the deceitful character of Popery. "Romanists (he truly says) misrepresent their own creed, their Church, and its institutions. The most forbidding features of the professedly immutable system are kept out of sight by its Jesuitical teachers, while a Protestant sense is attached to most of their doctrines and peculiarities. By this means they designedly misrepresent themselves, and impose on the public." One object, then, of this work is to delineate Popery in its true colours, and to divest it of the Protestant garb which it has for some time assumed. Indeed, however artful and learned Papists may attempt to explain away the unscriptural and anti-scriptural tenets and practices of Popery, that system is truly irreformable, and it cannot change essentially without destruction. Hence it professes to be unchangeable; and as Papists openly profess this immutability, Protestants cannot be charged with uncharitableness in ascribing great unfairness to them, when they wilfully and unblushingly deviate from the accredited standards of their Church.

Dr. Elliott has divided his elaborate treatise into four books. Of these, Book I., on the rule of faith, containing six chapters, gives an account of the standards of the Romish faith, and discusses the Popish doctrine concerning the Scriptures, tradition, infallibility, and the authority of the ancient fathers in the Church of Rome. The Romish and Protestant rules of faith are then compared and contrasted, and a thorough contrast they are. Book II., in sixteen chapters, treats on the nature and efficacy of the sacraments: the seven sacraments of the Romish Church are then discussed in the following order, viz., baptism; confirmation; transubstantiation, with the sacrifice of the mass, half-communion, and the idolatrous worship of the host; penance, absolution; confession, contrition and attrition, and satisfaction; purgatory, indulgence; extreme unction; orders; and matrimony. Book III. discusses the government of the Church of Rome, in fourteen chapters, on the Church, general councils, and the supremacy of the Pope. On this last subject the author gratefully acknowledges his obligations to Dr. Burrow's unanswered and unanswerable refutation of Papal supremacy. Book IV., in five chapters, treats on some miscellaneous doctrines and usages of the Church of Rome, particularly celibacy and the worship of saints.

The method pursued by Dr. Elliott is as follows:—The state-

ments of Romish doctrine are first exhibited in the very words of the creed, catechism, councils, Papal bulls, acknowledged theologians of the Romish Church, and the authentic records of history. Their statements are then examined in detail and most triumphantly refuted, and the truth of the Protestant doctrine is demonstrated.

In preparing the work for republication in England, the editor has revised it throughout with great care, and not without great need for such revision and correction; for in the New York edition (which is before us) we detected very numerous errors in names, and some graver mistakes in references; all these are now carefully corrected. Much important additional matter, from the best sources, has been introduced [between brackets], in order to illustrate more efficiently the arguments which are brought forward and the statements which are made. But what most enhances the value of the editor's labours is the proofs contained in the quotations from the fathers and other ancient ecclesiastical writers, ancient and modern. These quotations are all given in the original languages, with accurate references to the volumes and pages of the authors from whom they are extracted. We attach much importance to this portion of the editor's labours, as these quotations will enable any, who may hereafter be engaged in the Popish controversy, to go at once to the original authors, and verify them for themselves. Copious indexes of Scripture illustrated, of authorities consulted (four hundred in number), and of the principal matters, conclude this handsomely printed volume, the sale of three thousand copies of which, as it appeared in monthly parts, sufficiently attests the value of the work itself, as well as the great existing want of such a treatise. Without pledging ourselves for every sentiment of the Anglo-American author, we recommend this work as the most comprehensive and valuable treatise on Popery which is extant in the English language.

A Letter respectfully addressed to the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, Bart., First Lord of the Treasury, on the Restoration of Suffragan Bishops. By the Rev. THOMAS LATHBURY, M.A. London: Parker.

A LETTER on a very important subject, that of the revival of the order of suffragan bishops. It is on all hands admitted that something must be done to relieve our bishops of their labours; and, perhaps, the restoration of this order might, under the present circumstances of the Church, be attended with less inconvenience than any other plan.

The Anglican Church the Creature and Slave of the State.

In a Series of Lectures delivered before the Academy of the Catholic Religion. By the Rev. P. COOPER, of Dublin. London: Dolman. 1844.

It is most lamentable to behold the pass to which things are come in Ireland, not only from the present evils produced by such a state of enmity and folly, but from the seeming impossibility of devising any effectual remedy, and the dread, almost amounting to certainty, that they must needs grow worse and worse, till they lead to some terrible catastrophe, the very possibility of which is appalling.

It is said God helps those who will help themselves; but if a whole people will neither help themselves nor let others help them, nor even look to God to help them—priding themselves in the very things from whence all their evils arise!—who can possibly augur good concerning such a people, or devise a remedy for such a state of things? When a suicidal mania pervades a whole people, and that even the educated, nay more, even the ministry of religion, how can salvation find a way to reach them?

Mr. Cooper is a man of education—a minister of religion—an ambassador of peace; and he will be held responsible before God for these advantages, and the use which he has made of them in the judgment-day; and he is speaking to an audience of educated men, who will also be held accountable for the right use of their means and opportunities, by the God who gave them. Yet this man perverts his heavenly commission, to infuse envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness into the minds and hearts of an audience already too prone to such evil thoughts, and by that proneness alone tolerating such assertions, or lending a willing ear to such insinuations—assertions monstrous in falsehood as any of those spoken at Mullaghmast or any other of the monster meetings; which the parties themselves would probably shrink from uttering in what is called decent society; and which assuredly no decent society—whether Romanist or Protestant, not to say educated, not to say Christian society—would tolerate on this side of the Irish Channel.

Ireland is a strange land—her ministers of religion are unlike those of other lands; and when one of the higher ranks among them has openly expressed the brutal sentiment, that he rejoiced in thinking that he owed nothing to the aristocracy, save the sovereign contempt which he felt towards the whole class, we ought not, perhaps, to wonder at finding, that as we descend in the scale of rank, we find men yet lower and lower in the scale of brutality. And as there is, in many senses, contamination to be apprehended from coming into contact with certain persons,

so we would endeavour to keep at a very respectful distance from Dr. Higgins—this, we believe, is the euphonious name of the dignitary alluded to—and, of course, should try to keep at a still greater distance from the less dignified individuals of such a class.

Our answer to all such reviling as we find in this series of lectures is very short, but, to our minds, quite conclusive—namely, “by their fruits ye shall know them.” Genuine Christianity produces Christian fruits, both in the clergy and the laity. Ireland is, both in its land and in its people, a splendid soil rendered stagnant and fetid under the dank load of superstition which weighs it down like a nightmare. The Irish soil only wants cultivation to render it capable of supporting ten times its present population, which now annually sees famine staring it in the face. The Irish heart is naturally prone to generosity, tenderness, and every Christian virtue, but it has been maddened into everything Satanic, by political priests and mountebank demagogues. Let the Protestant and the Roman faith be tried by the test of the fruits, even in Ireland; and in the north, or wherever the Protestants have a quiet footing, behold the industry, and quiet, and good neighbourhood which prevail; while just in proportion as Romanism is more and more the religion of the people, the bogs are undrained, the land untilled, and suspicion of each other and the reign of terror consummate and seal the completion of the Roman ascendancy. It is a paradox—it is most unnatural—that the clergy, who are all of the educated class, should be apostles of barbarism; every child is taught in his first books that education *emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros*; but there we behold the educated classes in one most unnatural combination, using all the acquirements they have, only the more to barbarise.

And we would apply the same practical tests everywhere, to our own history in past times. We would point to England, great and glorious under Elizabeth—weak and contemptible under Mary—dwindling just in proportion as Popery was allowed to steal in and paralyze everything under the last of the Stuarts; and spring into vigour and respect among the nations as Protestantism became once more paramount in the house of Orange; and rising still more and more since the Church has become unalterably established in the succession of the house of Hanover. These are only political signs of prosperity, and we scarcely need say, that the higher consideration of the blessings of God on those who honour him is never absent from our thoughts; and that our highest objection to Roman Catholicism is, that it not only brings degradation on man, but offers also dishonour to God.

The Sacred History of Man; with other Poems. By the Rev. ALFRED SPALDING, B.A. London: Painter, Strand. 1844.

WE have read this volume with much pleasure. It is the production of a young man, who tells us, in a simple and touching preface, that it was composed in consequence of the disappointment of his hopes at Cambridge, arising from a failure of health. This statement would at once disarm all criticism, were the poems other than they are; but this volume may fairly court it, and suffer nothing in the encounter; for the whole is written in a truly Christian spirit, and contains only a few of the blemishes into which *all* young poets must necessarily fall. We like Mr. Spalding's productions so much, that we will point out what we think would, perhaps, be better otherwise; as we should fail in our duty if we did not do our best to push onward a young poet of so much promise. First, then, we would say a word or two against personification. We are quite aware that this is now very common, especially in religious poetry; but still we are old-fashioned critics, and are always ready to break a lance with a capital letter. We think it introduces confusion into the mind of the reader, as well as into that of the writer, presenting a doubtful and nebulous image, instead of the sharp, clear outline of truth. Thus, in the description of chaos, in the first book, which is short, but very good, we rather dislike this personification—

"Disorder sat on Ruin's shapeless throne;
Confusion backed Confusion," &c. (p. 7).

We prefer our old friend Ovid's method of referring chaos to the definite notion of elemental discord. The idea may not be very sublime, but it is a good example of referring abstract fancies to certain appreciable sources, and pursuing them in accordance with the principles on which that reference was made. The only other blemish we have to notice is the too frequent apostrophizing of the Deity. We allude to this from a certain conviction, that what is meant to be deeply reverential, does constantly produce in some minds quite the contrary feeling; and this is not the result of any peculiar frame of mind in the reader, so much as a quick consciousness that the language has fallen far short of what it essayed, and is sinking, Icarus-like, from the sky above, to the tumbling waters below. We know it occurs in Milton, and we use that as a still stronger argument; for what he has utterly failed in achieving will hardly be done by inferior, though probably far more reverential minds. We have not time to develop our theories farther—we only throw them out as hints to Mr. Spalding, and we feel sure he will take them in the spirit in which they are meant.

We shall now justify our expressions of high commendation by some passages which will speak for us and themselves. The poem consists of two books, and, to use the author's own words, "has for its subject the 'Sacred History of Man', and is designed not so much to relate the *facts* of man's history in their due order and succession, as to exhibit the *results* and *consequences* of those facts in the different relations in which they have, at various times, placed man to his Creator." We think the following passage very happily exemplifies the author's meaning. The world and all its works might attest the omnipotence of God, but it was reserved for man to praise him—

"Bright though all nature was, it could not raise
One tuneful note to its Creator's praise ;
The sun that every morn with robes of light
Decked the glad east, and chased the shades of night,
Rose on a silent world—his brilliant beam
Painted the woods, and glistened in the stream ;
But woke no soul to rapture—none to praise
The bounteous hand which gave those quickening rays.
Then man was formed—for noblest ends designed,
Pure spotless image of the Eternal Mind !
The earth, the heavens, were reared for his abode,
But man himself was formed alone for God." (p. 16).

The execution, of the Divine sentence when Sin, Death, Diseases,

" Et nova februm
Terris incubuit cohors,"

is described very forcibly in the second book ; and the only succour we can look for is pointed out in simple, truthful language.

Among the "Smaller Poems," we like the stanzas "written under feelings of disappointment," with which we close this short notice :—

"Chilled—blighted in her hopes—my soul no more
Pants for those pleasures which were once her joy ;
Spurns each delight that wooed her powers before,
Nor cares for biting grief to find alloy.

"Ah ! why so melancholy sad, my soul ?
Why art thou torn with hopeless, vain desires ?
Why let the tempest through thine empire roll,
When thou can still its thunders—quench its fires ?

"Lo ! the same voice that lulled the storm to rest,—
That laid tost ocean passive at His will,
Can soothe the billows of thy heaving breast,
And to thy troubled heart say—'Peace ! be still !'"

Mesmerism and its Opponents; with a Narrative of Cases.

By GEORGE SANDBY, Jun., A.M., Vicar of Flixton, Suffolk,
London: Longman. 1844.

THE believers in Mesmerism may find in this volume much to confirm their belief, since the work abounds in cases in which, as it is alleged, relief was experienced by persons who were suffering from disease. Mr. Sandby admits, however, that the individuals to whom Mesmerism was applied were diseased; so that, as we think, he has himself furnished a solution of the pretended mystery. They were suffering from peculiar diseases; and every one knows that such persons frequently experience sudden relief, especially when the imagination, as in these cases, is concerned. We look upon the whole thing as mere nonsense; and it appears to us that the subject is a very odd one for a clergyman to handle. One chapter in Mr. Sandby's volume we look upon as peculiarly objectionable, namely, chapter vi., in which he alludes to the miracles of the New Testament.

-
1. *On the Choral Service of the Anglo-Catholic Church.* London: Bell. 1844.
 2. *The Psalter and Canticles in the Morning and Evening Services of the Church of England, divided and pointed for Chanting; with Prefatory Directions.* By JOHN CALVERT, Choir-master at the Temple Church. George Bell. 1844.
 3. *The Seven Penitential Psalms, in Verse; being Specimens of a New Version of the Psalter.* By M. MONTAGUE. 8vo. Hatchard and Son. 1844.

THE first of these works is the composition of Mr. Burge, Q.C., one of the benchers of the Temple, who took a prominently active part in the restoration of the Temple Church, and now displays a commendable zeal to promote, so far as he can, the due celebration of divine worship within those time-honoured and nobly-adorned walls. Mr. Burge has collected much agreeable information on the choral services of the Catholic Church from the earliest ages, and gives a succinct catalogue of the most eminent composers of sacred music, for the use of our branch of Christ's Catholic Church. The learned author is an enthusiast on the subject, but he is nobly justified by the examples of Hooker and Herbert. Mr. Burge wishes to revive the use of the compositions of the earlier writers of the Anglo-Catholic Church music, whose simple but majestic melody and chastened gravity were so well calculated to awaken and preserve the most devout feelings. Unhappily, for the last hundred

years and more, these sublime compositions have been mostly thrown aside for those full of ornament and show, intended apparently to excite admiration for the composer or the performer, rather than to help holy aspirations heavenwards. Mr. Burge abhors, and we sympathize with his righteous indignation, the employment of male and female singers from the theatres, as is the custom at the Quebec-street and other fashionable proprietary chapels, for the express purpose of securing a congregation. On the contrary, Mr. Burge recommends a recurrence to the good old plan of a careful selection of the members of the choir, and that none should be chosen whose conduct, character, and habits would not bear the strictest investigation. The old cathedral establishments "required the laymen to be exemplary in their lives, of religious and devout habits, of competent learning, at least in the holy Scriptures, and habitual communicants." On no account ought they to be permitted to employ their musical talents at theatres, or other places of public amusement.

A neglect of this moral culture of members of choirs, and the irreverent behaviour of both clerical and lay members during the celebration of divine service, have tended more than any other cause to disparage cathedral service in the estimation of the pious. Mr. Burge deserves the thanks of Churchmen for pointing attention to this subject, and we hope his efforts will be crowned by the Master of the Temple's permitting a daily choral service. The choir-master, Mr. Calvert, complains of the want of it as an impediment to the efficiency of his choir. Mr. Burge expresses a wish for its revival; the funds of the two societies of the Inner and Middle Temple are ample for the purpose, and the treasurers and benchers are willing to dispense them. Why does Master Benson object to that for which so many are longing? Would Richard Hooker, the "judicious," his predecessor in the mastership, have hesitated and hung back, when laymen so eagerly were pressing forward and tendering means for the performance of the pious work? We trow not, and respectfully suggest that caution may be carried too far—may approach the verge of crime.

The third work on our list connected with Church music presents almost a ludicrous antithesis to the other two. While Mr. Burge and Mr. Calvert advocate the restoration of chanting the prose version of the Psalms, in preference to any modern metrical version of the Psalter, Mr. M. Montague offers specimens of an entirely new one, "fitted to the tunes used in churches." Mr. Montague would have been nearer the mark had he written "used in meeting-houses." This new candidate

for choral fame wishes to supply a metrical version better than the OLD one of Sternhold and Hopkins, or the NEW one by Nathaniel Brady and Nahum Tate, which may avoid the faults and deficiencies of those versions respectively, and emulate the good points of each. As Mr. Montague has published the seven penitential Psalms by way of specimen of his proposed version of the entire Psalter—for Mr. Montague “honestly and confidently asserts that they are *patterns* to which *the whole piece*, such as it is, will not in any way be found unequal”—we will, in a smaller way of business, to adopt the author’s style of phraseology, quote a verse or two from his new version, and ask our readers whether it surpasses those which we admit have been too long in use:—

“Hence from me, ye! all who rejoice
In vanity and ill;
The Lord hath heard my weeping’s voice—
He will my prayer fulfil.

“My foes shall all confounded be,
Sore vex’d and mark’d of blame;
They shall be made turn back and flee,
And sudden put to shame.

“The Lord the sinner frees—
He will deliver *him* :
And from all their iniquities
He Israel will *redeem*.”

A Guide to Life Assurance; containing an Account of the Origin and Progress, an Explanation of the System, and pointing out the Benefits of Life Assurance. With Directions for effecting a Policy. By ALEXANDER YOUNG. London: Groombridge. 1844.

THIS is a useful little work, and one which will prove serviceable to those who are anxious to make a provision for their families after their decease. It contains all the necessary information, besides pointing out the various advantages which life assurance secures.

A Course of Lectures, suitable to the Times, on the Contents of the Book of Common Prayer. By the Rev. FREDERIC DUSATOY, A.M. London: Nisbet. Part II.

WITHOUT pledging ourselves to all the opinions contained in these sermons, we can recommend them for general use, feeling assured that they abound in much practical illustration of our services.

A Pictorial Tour in the Mediterranean, including Malta, Dalmatia, Turkey, Asia-Minor, Grecian Archipelago, Egypt, Nubia, Greece, Ionian Islands, Sicily, Italy, and Spain.
By J. H. ALLAN, Member of the Athenian Archæological Society, and of the Egyptian Society of Cairo. London: Longman. 1843. One vol. folio.

OF all the numerous contributions which have of late years been added to literature and the fine arts this is incontestably the most splendid, and, what is not always the attendant quality, the most gratifying. It is splendid, not merely in the outward getting up, in the paper, and in the type, but the illustrations are so profuse and so magnificent, that while we are lost in present admiration and past reminiscences as we gaze on them, we cannot but wonder at the liberality that has given, at comparatively small cost, such an intellectual banquet to the public, and at the same time hope that the public will reciprocate the generosity and reward the talent which accompanies it, by extending effective popularity and patronage to a work such as it has not often the advantage of being called upon to foster and protect.

It is a book over which the artist may revel—a volume attractive to the fair, from the graces with which it everywhere sparkles; the scholar will find it continually awakening pleasant memories and ceaselessly giving birth to new suggestions; the loiterer will be cheated into instructive information, if he look upon it never so listlessly; and even the foreigner, to whom the letter-press might be unintelligible, will find the plates more elegant than words, and detailing in the present the story of the past in a way impressive to every ear and every heart. He who has the good fortune to possess this book may enjoy all the advantages of travel, without any of its evils. He may take a pleasant pictorial run, in a well-appointed steamer, from the Mersey to Malta; and having in his mental vision beheld all that is worthy in the old home of the Phœnicians and the later refuge of warrior monks, he may pass agreeably over to Dalmatia, and dream through a long summer's day of the ancient plunderers who gave the sturdy Roman government of their day more trouble than more powerful nations; thence, as he is speculating upon the uses to which the once picturesque Dalmatic robe has fallen, Mr. Allan, by mechanical powers far more safe and infinitely more comfortable than those which, *ad Græca Kalendas*, are to raise Mr. Henson's æriel machine from *terra firma*, conveys him, like a hero in Eastern romance, to that Asiatic encampment in Europe which occupies the ground fertilized by the blood of rude savages, of elegant Greeks, of

crafty Romans, haughty Tartars, ignorant Christians, cheating Venetians ; and which, amid all the storms with which it has been swept, is yet fair in its decay, and sometimes terrible in its decrepitude. And from this corner of Europe the reader is conveyed to the land which for thousands of years was tributary to foreign masters—which groaned beneath the Scythian, and was alternately lashed by the Lydian and the Mede ; from this land of mixed recollections we are wafted to those sunny Greek isles from which much of it was peopled, and no portion of which, even in the days of its bloom, could, we think, have looked half so fair as by Mr. Allan's magic pencil some of them are here pourtrayed, like fading flowers indeed, but with life enough in them to give them beauty, and beauty enough to win our sympathy and love. And then succeed scenes fairer still ; for we find ourselves in the country that has been the mother of all arts and all sciences, and we gaze around us with silent awe and admiration at the stupendous magnificence and the gorgeous mysteries which are here unveiled. Egypt was never so revealed to the eye of an absentee as Mr. Allan here presents it ; and no description of ours could do justice to drawings which not only place us in positions which few can ever reach, and *they* not without a vast outlay of physical and pecuniary means, but which compel those who look to read histories of bygone people at a glance, and to understand by the eye what others have striven in vain to render intelligible to the ear.

At seeing these grand, these gloomy, these graceful, and these monstrous, yet not deformed, remains of Egyptian art, we cannot help asking ourselves, could it be the senseless worshippers of a cat, a crocodile, or an onion, that had the mind to imagine and the force to execute such time-defying works as these ? Yet so it was ; and of the twenty thousand cities of Egypt, not one but had its wonders of mental greatness and physical power, that would have made the fortune of a wilderness of Glypthotheks. As we look upon these engraved drawings, the more we are lost in admiration at their expressive eloquence. We feel, see, read, and understand old Egypt's wondrous tale. We require not to be told that rain seldom falls *there*—that fact is really artistically conveyed. We perceive, without explanation, that mud and sand are the foundations in which the children of *Ægyptus* lived for a time, and left memories for ever. These able productions of our countryman speak to the immortality with which the kings of the Nile promised to endue themselves ; and in contemplating those massive, fanciful, and picturesque fragments of a once gigantic whole, we are willing to acknowledge that a people who could raise them were even older than

the some dozen thousand years to which they laid claim even in the days of Herodotus.

The flowers that yet lie upon the galvanized corse of Greece, the beauties that yet distinguish the sweet islands of Ionia, and the modern aspect of the capital of the three-cornered island, old Sicilia, whose air was so loaded with the odour of the rich blossoms that sprang from her soil that old Diodorus tells us hounds lost the scent in hunting in consequence—all these are masterly revealed to us in their counterfeit presentiments. Of Italy and Spain, too, we have brief but pleasant glances—unsatisfying only that they make us desire to see more: but it is, after all, the Egyptian and Nubian portion of this book that will snatch for it an immortal wreath from celebrity; and well will the garland be deserved, for the whole volume is an honour to the country, and we may well be proud of the author who produced it.

1. *Essays and Poems.* By E. F. ROBERTS. Saunders and Otley. 1844.

2. *The Hope that is in us: a Poem.* Hatchard and Son. 1843.

3. *Horse-shoe Nails; or, New Ideas on Old Subjects.* By MINOR HUGO. Nos. 8, 9, and 10. London: Earle. 1843.

THE book which stands first on the above list consists of a drama imitative, *longissimo intervallo*, of Goëthe's "Faust," and some essays of a Germanic complexion. The second on our list is a string of didactic couplets, after the manner of Pope's "Essay on Man;" and the third consists of some short essays, intended apparently by the author to be couched in the style of Benjamin Franklin. Over each may be aptly suspended the Horatian maxim, for a motto—

"Decipit exemplar vitii imitabile."

The Distinction between Instinct and Reason. The Introductory Discourse to a Series of Lectures on the Properties and Functions of Animal Life. Delivered before the Philosophical and Literary Society at Portsmouth. By J. STRANG, M.D., Vice-President of the Society. London: Seeleys. 1843.

THIS is an essay much more to our taste than the essays we have just alluded to, in which a difficult subject is ably treated. Dr. Strang's discourse is full of anecdotes illustrative of the habits and instincts of animals, which ever please a pure taste both in childhood and old age. Books of natural history are among the first we relish and the last we relinquish. Many years ago—and as all the parties named are now in their graves we may innocently narrate it—a country gentleman mentioned to us, with

a shake of his head, an instance, as he termed it, of the decay of Lord Stowell's faculties, that on his importuning that noble and learned person to attend a turnpike-road committee, Lord Stowell declined, because he had to see that morning a boa-constrictor swallow a goat. Remembering that the *locus in quo* was London, we, for *goat*, should read *rabbit*; though in the East undoubtedly large serpents of this class can manage a goat. Probably Lord Stowell saw the worthy squire's disdain of his morning's employment, and chose sportively to exaggerate his pet's prowess to justify his own attendance upon his meal and amaze his rural friend. But our conclusion upon the whole matter is, that Lord Stowell's love of natural history was strong, and his mind by no means weak.

Principles of Education practically considered, with an Especial Reference to the Present State of Female Education in England. By M. A. STODART, Author of "Everyday Duties," "Hints on Reading," &c. Seeley and Co. 1844.

WE are ever ready to encourage well-intended, conscientious attempts to promote the progress of education upon Christian principles, and as a well-meant effort we commend Mrs. Stodart's present work, but we cannot assign unqualified praise to its execution. We have met with one remark, however, especially useful to that section of the religious world to which we presume Mrs. Stodart belongs—the self-called Evangelical school, who, in their horror of their disciples resting upon justification by works, are incessantly preaching to the young and the ardent the worthlessness of works, at a season when they need every inducement, collateral as well as direct, to their performance.

"The well-known fact (says Mrs. Stodart) may be adduced, that the children of religious parents are often far less manageable, more wilful, and more disobedient, than those of worldly persons; and the natural inference is, that religious [*i.e.*, in our author's vocabulary, 'Evangelical'] parents are often deficient in the employment of means. Perhaps the first thing (continues Mrs. Stodart) that strikes the mind in glancing at the subject is, that with professedly religious persons *principles* are not sufficiently enforced. The religion of Jesus Christ is a religion of motives; and in every stage of progress it is necessary to press on the heart that outward conduct is of no value in the sight of an all-seeing God, except as it emanates from right motives. Worldly persons of honourable feeling give their children motives upon which to act; and, though these motives are worthless as the dust when weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, still the very fact of having some fixed principles engrafted in the mind, and continually appealed to, will ensure a greater steadiness and consistency of conduct than where there are none at all."

Whatever may be Mrs. Stodart's regret or astonishment at

this "well-known fact," we assure her it is but the natural consequence of the moral training, or rather no training, of children in that section of the Christian community to which every other page of her book shows that she herself belongs.

Hydropathy : the Theory, Principles, and Practice of the Water Cure, with Cases. By EDWARD JOHNSON, M.D., Author of "Life, Health, and Disease." One vol. 12mo. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

THIS book is evidently intended for the multitude, and not for the profession of which its author is a member. It is written with much tact, to promote the views and interests of those men especially engaged in the Therapeutic novelty, "the cold water cure," but with the same morbid zeal which too often inflames the minds of men won over to a new nostrum—they look through a prejudiced medium at its merits, permit their imaginations to run wild, and are hurried on beyond the pale of their calm and better judgment to false conclusions. We are far from refusing to Hydropathy, when curtailed of its extravagances, its meed of praise, or to Dr. E. Johnson all that is due to him for his talent and industry evidenced in the work before us, but his cases are badly defined, and may mislead the careless reader. Other practitioners in Therapeutics, for whose more established practice Dr. E. Johnson seems to have too little respect, will see at once his case headed "Consumption" (page 41) bears no evidence of its being that disease; and it will be equally evident to them that the one headed "Baldness" (page 57) must have been a very uncommon case of "Porrigio Decalia," and not what is generally understood by baldness: hence the former may mislead the anxious consumptive patient to false hopes, expense, and fatal treatment—whilst the latter may induce some of those with hairless scalps and weak enclosures to run to Germany to get new fledged.

Many of the "cures" are, we must admit, very startling to us, especially that of "hernia," which depends on a mechanical imperfection in structure; and we should have looked for as readily the sprouting out of new arms and legs from the human trunk, under the vegetating influence of water, as the cure of this calamity; but trusting to the discrimination of the public, as their best guard against a useless journey to Grafenburg, and congratulating Dr. E. Johnson on the advantages he himself has derived from Hydropathy, we leave his work to struggle for a while on the billows of public opinion, to find a place at last on the shelf, from which, after the lapse of a few years, and the natural death of the hydro-mania, we do not think its author will be disposed to remove it.

The Old Church Clock. By RICHARD PARKINSON, B.D.,
Canon of Manchester. London : J. G. F. and J. Rivington.
Second Edition. 1844.

In the little volume before us we are introduced more intimately to one whose memory has been immortalized by Wordsworth, in his beautiful sonnets "On the River Duddon"—we mean the Rev. Robert Walker, of Seathwaite. The work abounds with interesting and entertaining passages in the life and experience of that useful and devoted parish priest. The primitive simplicity of his life and manners—the affection and zeal with which he discharged the duties of pastor, husband, and parent, are clearly and forcibly illustrated in this little history, which we have much pleasure in commending to our readers. His character is thus described in the Introduction :—

"Though he dressed so plainly, though his manners were so simple, and his mode of life so laborious, yet his parishioners loved and respected him. Indeed, who would not have loved such an amiable character? Ever ready to oblige, and studious to promote their good, he lived amongst those favoured people, himself blessed and happy in their affection, for the uninterrupted space of sixty-seven years, daily ministering to their necessities, and multiplying their enjoyments."

We regret that want of space precludes us from quoting the work at any length; one or two passages must suffice. The following description of the manner in which the psalmody was conducted in the romantic little chapel at Seathwaite is very inspiring :—

"There was no praising God by deputy.....No, sir! every man, woman, and child sung for themselves lustily, and with a right good will. They sung the air in a minor key, as is always the case among the inhabitants of mountain districts—perhaps because they learn to pitch their notes to the echoes of their native valleys; but it had from that circumstance a more solemn and devotional effect. It was taken up by those without the doors with the same zeal as by those within, for all knew the air as familiarly as their own names. Here was a strict compliance with David's precept, 'Young men and maidens, old men and children, praise ye the Lord.' The mighty sound rushed down the vale of Ulpha like the bursting of a mountain cataract; nor, for aught I can tell, was it checked in its onward course till it had scaled the heights of the surrounding mountains, and died away at last in a gentle whisper, on the lonely summit of Black Comb! *Died away*, did I say? Forgive me, sir, the lowly thought! Far higher than the cliffs of Helvellyn did that holy psalm ascend; nor stayed it in its upward flight till it approached, as a memorial of sweet incense, the throne of God, there to be heard again when earthly sound shall be no more!"

In the concluding part of the Introduction, the reverend au-

thor, taking a brief review of the fruits of this "good man's" labours, says—

"Schools, public institutions, vast parishes, rural districts, are now feeling the impulse towards sound and good principles which was first impressed on a narrow domestic circle by the hand of Robert Walker; and the sphere of his influence is still enlarging itself with every revolving year, and every successive descendant added to this right-hearted brotherhood. What a light does this fact throw upon the true reasons why our beloved country still maintains its ground among the nations, as to power and morality, notwithstanding the painful appearances of disorder and almost disorganization which its external surface too often exhibits! We do not see the strong under-girdings by which, in the shape of pious tradition from holy fathers to obedient children, the whole framework of the Church in this country is held together; and how faith and piety are pervading the very centre of our strength, while to outward appearance they may seem almost in a state of absolute dissolution. Would, therefore, that the history of our parish priesthood could be written! for it is around *their* firesides that at least the embers of national and religious faith and fidelity have in all ages been kept ever burning!"

And what a blessing it would be to our dear native land if the like spirit animated the great body of our clergy at the present day. Many there are, particularly amongst the younger members, who are following, and laying great stress upon, primitive customs and usages: we would point them to Robert Walker, a pattern of primitive and apostolic simplicity, as worthy their imitation, and would say, "Go and do thou likewise;" and you will then better understand wherein consists the true dignity of the priesthood. Robert Walker died the 25th June, 1802, at the advanced age of ninety-three. In the words of his biographer—

"He went to bed about twelve o'clock the night before he died. As his custom was, he went, tottering and leaning on his daughter's arm, to examine the heavens and meditate a few minutes in the open air. 'How clear the moon shines to-night!' He said these words, sighed, and lay down. At six next morning he was found a corpse. Many a tear, and many a heavy heart, and many a grateful blessing followed him to the grave."

Such was Robert Walker in his life and in his death. May each one who reads his brief history strive to imitate his usefulness, and to attain unto the like most holy faith, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God." "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace." "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his!"

The Child's Book of Homilies. By a MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. London: Edwards and Hughes. 1844.

GREAT and many are the instructional advantages which the children of this generation enjoy over their fathers. Not many years ago it was thought necessary to address children in language little less silly than the babble of *Juliet's* nurse, and sacred subjects were handled with an irreverent familiarity, to suit, forsooth, juvenile capacities. This was a grievous error, and we welcome every fresh attempt, on the part of those engaged in the education of youth, to repair it. We consider the little work before us as a successful effort in this direction. The author endeavours to make grave scriptural themes acceptable to childhood, by connecting them with the sunshine, the flowers, the streams of every-day life, and to each of his little homilies has appended verses on the subject propounded, of eminent beauty. We give one, taken almost at random, as a specimen. The subject is Our Lord in the Temple, when he went up with his parents to Jerusalem. Middle-aged men and women, who remember the nursery rhymes of their childhood, will be forcibly struck with the contrast presented thereto, by the following beautiful yet simple ballad strain:—

- “ God's house in fair Jerusalem
Was rich with cedar, gold, and gem—
A marvel of the ancient days,
To all the land a pride and praise.
- “ A pile upon mount Zion's brow,
Of marble, white as falling snow,
With golden turrets many a one
Flashing beneath the noon-day sun.
- “ There spotless lamb and soft-eyed dove
Were slain before the Lord above;
Showing how Christ our hope should die
On the sad cross of Calvary.
- “ All sons of Israel, year by year,
Unto that holy place drew near,
And Christ came up—a little child—
And on its gold and glory smil'd.
- “ He came—His own received him not,
They scorned Him for his lowly lot;
Although for Christ, for Christ alone,
Men piled that temple, stone on stone.
- “ For Christ their daily offerings died,
And yet the priests swept by in pride,
Nor saw the Lord of all things fair
Was kneeling with the meanest there.

- "God's holy place we build not now
As it was built on Zion's brow ;
Our wintry storms would fret and wear
The yellow gold, the marble fair.
- "Yet many a house of prayer we have
Where help and hope of Christ we crave :
A thousand hills, a thousand dells,
Make answer to our Sabbath-bells.
- "Go up, go up, beloved child !
Through village, lane, and wood-path wild :
Go up unto the place of prayer,
And Christ the Lord will bless thee there.
- "No flashing gem, no yellow gold,
In the dim church wilt thou behold;
But God's own words of truth may be
As goodly pearls, my child, to thee.
- "The bleeding lamb thou wilt not find,
Yet go, and with a lowly mind ;
Servants of God will teach thee then
How Christ was slain for sinful men.
- "Go up with joy, beloved one !
Go up beneath the Sabbath sun !
The holy child of Galilee
In his own temple bowed the knee."

The Young Composer ; or, Progressive Exercises in English Composition. By JAMES CORNWELL, Joint Author of *Allen and Cornwell's "School Grammar,"* &c. London : Simpkin and Marshall. 1844. Part I.

WE are somewhat sceptical as to the feasibility of *teaching* the art of composition at schools ; but this may be, we confess it, an old-fashioned prejudice, inasmuch as in our school-days boys were ordered to compose themes and verses, and were flogged or scolded when they failed. They were required to *learn* the art of composition—they were rarely, if ever, *taught* the art. Mr. Cornwell says his attempt to teach this art is the first of its kind, and we think it a happy one. We hope, however, that Mr. Cornwell will not augment the multitude of writers, who, according to him, must all have been self-taught. The old system has produced writers in abundance, and, let scoffers stand apart, good ones too. Let any competent judge of a powerful pen turn to the leading article of the *Times* for March 20, upon Lord Ashley's amendment, and then turn to those pages of Addison to which Dr. Johnson referred all students of English composition, as models for their imitation ; and, lastly, ask himself whether any novel method of instruction is needed to teach the present generation the art of composition.

internal character of the Church, which, in their nature, their origin, and influences, are all deserving of the most anxious attention of the ecclesiastical historian."

There is much of truth in the above extract, but the style is so vicious, and the tone, unconsciously no doubt to Dr. Welsh, is so closely in harmony with that of writers who sneer at "modes of faith" as the silly distinctions of "senseless zealots," that we could not pass it by without an expression of disapprobation. Had the whole of these elements of Church history, or any considerable portion of them, been couched in similar language, we should not recommend them, as we now do, to the careful perusal of students. There is one great improvement of which this work is susceptible; and we wish, for the sake of those youthful readers whom Dr. Welsh principally addresses, that the learned and reverend author will accept our friendly hint in the further progress of his labours, and that is, to abridge his notes. There are notes at the foot of almost every other page, and notes at the end of the volume. Foot notes, except such as are referential merely, are always distracting and unpleasant, and may, with common care, be almost always incorporated into the text, and where they cannot, they may be safely omitted, as not germane to the subject under discussion. Dr. Welsh abandons the old method of conducting the history of the Church by centuries, and adopts a division by certain remarkable epochs. For example, the birth of Christ dividing between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, and under the latter, the reign of Constantine and the Reformation. The period comprised in Dr. Welsh's first volume is that from the birth of Christ to the reign of Constantine. We shall be glad to see the second volume.

The Doctrine of Changes, as applicable both to the Institutions of Social Life, and to the Progressive Order of Nature. By the Author of "Morning and Evening Sacrifice." Edinburgh: Clark. 1844.

THIS is the old popular work called "My Old House," enlarged and renovated by much elegant thought and useful philosophy. It is a book to take up often, to cull snatches from, whereupon to meditate, and become wiser and happier; one to take into sunny nooks and ponder over; one to have friendly debate upon by winter firesides; in short, we do not know any time or season in which this work may not be read with advantage;—and what higher praise can we award it?

1. *Sermons preached in St. Mary's Episcopal Chapel, Dumfries.*
By the Rev. WM. PITT M^CFARQHAR, B.A. Hatchards.
2. *Practical Sermons preached in Hanover Chapel, Regent-street.*
By the Rev. G. D. HILL, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

THE author of the first volume of sermons has devoted many of them to illustrate the different anniversary services of our Church, and we most cordially approve of any attempt of this kind, since it is only by a due observance of the successive sacred times and seasons of the ecclesiastical year that both the theory and practice of our most holy religion can be fully and adequately developed. Those who make light of the recurring festivals of the Church are generally found to preach only *part* of Gospel truth, giving undue prominence to one or two particular doctrines, while the more practical duties of Christian life are but seldom enforced. Now nothing can be more calculated to obviate only a partial exhibition of Scripture truth than a due observance of these holy seasons, which through the admirable arrangement of our Liturgy, bring before the mind all the great points of sacred history, and permit her ministers to enlarge upon them, as they periodically recur. Thus, if the minister of Christ is desirous of bringing forward every doctrine and every duty, allowing to each its due weight in the scale of Gospel truth, he cannot be too scrupulous in his observance of the times and seasons appointed by the Church to be kept holy.

The author commences the volume with a sermon on the office of the ministry, wherein he very properly deduces all ministerial authority from Christ himself, who transmitted it to his apostles, and they, in like manner, to their descendants. Without asserting so much, therefore, the author would seem to conclude, that they only are lawfully called who can trace their descent from the apostles, the foundation-stones of the Church Catholic—and we trust that the number of those who see the *practical* importance of this truth is daily increasing in our Church. We say *practical*, because the acknowledgment of this principle is absolutely necessary for the recovery of that unity which, in these latter days, we have so painfully lost.

But it is of little use to admit the historical fact of apostolical succession, if we choose to neglect or cast aside the teaching and doctrine of the successors of the apostles—if we fail to give reverence to the belief of the Church universal, and set up in its stead the dogmas of some school or party. We have been led to make these reflections by a sermon in this volume—"On the mode of a sinner's acceptance"—which we cannot but think a defective exhibition of Scripture truth. The author's design

in this discourse is to prove that faith, and faith *alone*, is the sole instrument of justification. Now, although this is not the place to enter upon any formal argument as to the mode of a sinner's acceptance, we may safely assert this, viz., that the Church of England looks upon *baptism* as an instrument in justification, and therefore we consider that no minister in her communion can treat of the subject, consistently with a belief in the truth of her Articles, without giving to baptism its due part in the office of justification.

We cannot understand why so much difficulty and misapprehension exist on this subject. The Church of England is as clear and distinct in her doctrine of justification as we could possibly desire. She holds the doctrine of justification by faith most firmly, but she also declares the justifying power of baptism. In fact, as the Bishop of London asserted in his last Charge, "justification begins in baptism," while the *state* of justification is *sustained by faith*. Thus the two views are not necessarily contrary to each other, except when one or other is held *exclusively*: when both are connected, they harmoniously blend, and form one beautiful and consistent truth.

Of the second volume of sermons we cannot speak in terms of sufficient admiration; they are truly what they profess to be—"practical sermons." The author has the very rare power of keeping to his subject, exhibiting a beautiful unity of thought throughout the whole of his discourses—not dividing and subdividing them, as is too common with those who are deficient in comprehensiveness of mind, and who branch out into several subjects, in order to conceal their inability to treat properly of *one*. In this respect alone these sermons are worthy of all imitation, but only a perusal of them can give an adequate idea of the simplicity of diction, combined with the elegance of imagination, which they display. We cannot resist giving one short extract, which will be sufficient to show we have not spoken too highly of their merits. It is from a sermon, the subject of which is "Social Relations," and the author is contrasting the benefits which accrue from a state of society with the evils and horrors of barbarism. He says—

"Among barbarous tribes, where no one is more rich than his neighbour, there are none of the comforts and few of what we term the necessities of life. There is little leisure, and therefore little science, learning, or knowledge. Every man toils for his own food, and the savage of the forest has neither what his own soil might produce, nor what others do. Evils, palliated by the skill of civilized man, are to him a dire and inevitable scourge. What is to us an indisposition of a few hours or days, is to him a frightful pestilence. He sees it ad-

vancing, and hopeless, helpless, lies him down to die; and no brother will approach to tend his couch, and no Christian hand is nigh to sooth his pillow or raise his feverish head. No hospital is there in ready succour of disease; no physician to heal; no medicine to allay pain, or gentle attendant to solace the dreariness of his parting hour. No priest is at his side with glad tidings of salvation through the merits of Christ; no Gospel is his companion on his death-bed, to support him in his final struggles; no holy ordinances have imparted grace, and assured him of communion with the saints in heaven. Cast out from among his fellows, avoided and destitute, he lingers through his expiring agonies, without a cup of cold water to cool his tongue, or one consoling assurance that what he suffers here will carry a patient soul to everlasting happiness hereafter."

A Survey of the Holy Land: its Geography, History, and Destiny; designed to elucidate the Imagery of Scripture, and Demonstrate the Fulfilment of Prophecy. By J. T. BANNISTER. With an Introduction by the Rev. W. MARSH, D.D. Embellished with Maps and Engravings. Bath: Binns and Goodwin. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1844. 8vo.

EVERY work which has for its object the better understanding of the Bible is a useful addition to sacred literature; and Mr. Bannister's "Survey," though confessedly a compilation designed principally for the young, will be found to throw much light on the geography and history of Palestine which students of a larger growth may consult to their great advantage. Part I. treats on the geography of Canaan, in six chapters, comprising its historical and physical geography, mountains, valleys, and plains of Palestine, rivers, fountains, and lakes, natural history, and a topographical survey, in alphabetical order, of the cities, towns, and villages of Palestine. Jerusalem, of course, occupies a considerable space; this article condenses the accounts of that memorable city which have been given by the most distinguished modern travellers. Part II., in nine chapters, exhibits a compendious history of Palestine from the first settlement of the country by the Canaanites to its final subjugation by the Turks. The "Destiny" of the Holy Land is the subject of the third part, in which the compiler has brought together the various prophecies which are considered to refer to the ultimate restoration of the Jews to their native land; and he concludes his volume with an appeal to Christians in behalf of the despised people of Israel. Twenty-three engravings (including two maps) adorn this handsomely-printed volume, which we commend to the attention of all who are desirous of understanding those "holy Scriptures which are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

Altars Prohibited by the Church of England. By WILLIAM GOODE, M.A., F.A.S., Rector of St. Antholin. London: Hatchard and Son. 1844.

"OF all the acts of anti-Protestant agitators"—the Tractarians—"none (says Mr. Goode) perhaps more demands an attention at the present moment than the attempt to substitute *altars* for *communion-tables* in our churches.....They are now notoriously set up for the furtherance of Tractarian views of the nature of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The communion-table is thrust out in *old* churches to make way for them. They are studiously introduced, wherever practicable, and even in the most disingenuous and characteristically Tractarian way, into *new* churches." (pp. 1, 2). To show that these altars neither are nor ever were sanctioned by our Church is the object of Mr. Goode's laboriously compiled and documentary pamphlet. In the prosecution of his design he has examined and adduced the writings of the martyrs and confessors for the Reformation, the royal injunctions and visitation articles of Queen Elizabeth, the canons of 1571 and of 1603, and the declarations of the most eminent divines of our Church, especially those of Bishops Morton and Jewel and the venerable Hooker. The result of Mr. Goode's researches is a demonstration of the truth of the fact asserted in his title-page, viz., that "*altars*" are "*prohibited by the Church of England*;" and that "*the only thing which properly answers the description of that article of Church furniture which is to be used for the administration of the holy communion is a table of joiner's work standing on a frame, and unattached to any part of the church; the floor of the chancel being paved underneath where it stands, and the walls at the back of it finished uniformly with the remainder, so as to present no unsightly appearance on its removal. This alone answers the description of what is required by our Church.*" (p. 46). Mr. Goode's publication is not of a nature to admit of quotations; but we do hope that this necessarily brief notice of its important contents will induce our readers to procure it, and study it for themselves. No one, we feel assured, who gives it a candid and dispassionate perusal, will ever desecrate any church, or permit it to be desecrated, by the erection of an altar.

Bell's Outline Compositions from the Liturgy. London: Longman. 1844.

THIS work, still in progress, is not without merit, but it hardly performs the promise held out in the early numbers.

Jerusalem and its Environs. By W. H. BARTLETT. London :
Virtue. 1844.

"THIS little work is the result of a visit to Jerusalem in the summer of 1842. Before that period the author was quite unable to form any distinct idea of its appearance from then existing works ; not so much from the absence of graphic descriptions, for such abound, as from the desultory style of the writers and the absence of a connected plan, together with the want of *correct* and *well-chosen* views. On this last point he may perhaps be deemed to arrogate too much, yet his conviction is honest, that *no* views of Jerusalem, *at all* valuable for the purpose of topographical or historical illustration, have yet appeared, though so many have been published, which, as works of art, are very beautiful. This led him to form the idea of attempting to give a clear, connected, and accurate view of the city, by gradually tracing its progress from the earliest period of authentic history, restoring its past appearance by a careful study of existing data, and exhibiting its present condition, in a series of views *chosen with express reference to historical illustration*, and in which the *local character* should be the only object, and where, at every step, the past and present should be compared." —*Preface.*

We think it right to say that the same want has been felt by us, and it will be gratifying to Mr. Bartlett to be told, that in our case it has been completely supplied by his little work. And travellers should be told, that it is not *size* which constitutes the value of illustrations, but *accuracy*. This *little* work, only in octavo, and some of the illustrations mere vignettes, throws far more light upon the history and topography of Jerusalem than all the preceding folios and quartos, and that because the views are *well chosen*, are not *made up*, and are most *feelingly executed*. And the publisher should not be without his share of praise, for the book is most beautifully got up, in printing and embellishment.

Not the least curious part of the volume is a description of the grand Mosque, with the vaults beneath, a survey of which was effected by an English architect through matchless effrontery and singular good fortune ; and which, accompanied with plans and sections, the said architect has communicated in a letter to Mr. Bartlett, printed in the Appendix to his volume.

The Theses of Erastus, touching Excommunication. Translated from the Latin, with a Preface. By the Rev. ROBERT LEE, D.D. Edinburgh : Macphail. London : Simpkin. 1844. WE have heard a great deal of Erastianism in Scotland, and many of our readers will prefer having the information they want in this small compass, rather than going to Hammond's folios. To those who desire to dive deeper in the matter we recommend "Hammond on the Power of the Keys."

1. *The Cistercian Saints of England: St. Stephen Harding.*
2. *The Family of St. Richard the Saxon; St. Richard, King; St. Willibald, Bishop; St. Walburga, Virgin, Abbess; St. Winibald, Abbot. 1844.*
3. *St. Augustine of Canterbury, Apostle of the English. 1844.*

WE prepared a notice of the first of these three works for our April number, of which a pressure of other matter prevented the insertion. The life of St. Stephen was issued from Mr. Newman's retreat at Littlemore with the well-known initials J. H. N. annexed to the advertisement, and to him, therefore, we attributed the authorship of this piece of Papistical biography. We had long been prepared for much in favour of the monastic life from Mr. Newman; but we must confess that we felt astonished as we read the "Life of St. Stephen, Abbot, and Founder of the Cistercian Order;" and as we proceeded from page to page, we ever and again were looking for marks of quotation, and could not help thinking that Mr. Newman was quoting from medieval biographies, and would presently modify the glowing eulogies of monastic virtues and the narrative of monastic miracles therein recorded; but we looked in vain, and therefore at last concluded that, in the "Life of St. Stephen," Mr. Newman had sent forth to the world an acknowledgment of his own belief in the direct efficacy of penance to wash away sins, and the influential intercession of departed spirits for those yet in the flesh.

More than one reader of intelligence expressed, in our hearing, an opinion that, before a second biography of the promised series appeared, Mr. Newman would enter into communion with the Church of Rome, and that the publication of the "Life of St. Stephen" was a step towards that destination. In the advertisement, however, to "The Family of St. Richard the Saxon," Mr. Newman "is concerned to find that he is mistaken by some persons for the author." No reader, not in Mr. Newman's confidence, could come to any other conclusion. Whoever the author may be, he ought, as an honest man, to belong to the Church of Rome, for no monk of the middle ages could have written with a more firm belief in the curative virtues of relics and the tombs of saints, and the continuance of miraculous powers in sincere believers, than the writer under Mr. Newman's wing. So entirely Papistical are the books under our review, that the first of them was, soon after its appearance, adopted in the different Roman Catholic seminaries in this country, and the two additional volumes before us are even

more entitled to the same reception. In the "Life of St. Stephen Harding" the charms of a monastic life are principally dwelt upon; but in the two succeeding works the most objectionable doctrines of the Romish Church are unequivocally inculcated, and the spiritual supremacy of Rome distinctly avowed:—

"That illustrious city from which the frail memorials of earthly pomp and temporal dominion had now departed, to make way for the one only dynasty which is without limit and without end—the empire of empires; the substance whereof all other dominions are but the shadows, though itself but the shadow of that better and lasting kingdom into which it shall one day be absorbed."

The present power of St. Peter upon earth is recognized by the anonymous writer, who, in his advertisement, acknowledges his obligation for the materials of the "Life of St. Augustine of Canterbury" to the Rev. Charles Marriot, fellow of Oriel College, the well-known initials J. H. N. being withdrawn. Oh, Mr. Newman, is this the part of a candid Christian? First, a Papistical biography—so Papistical, indeed, that it was read as a spiritual exercise by the pupils at a Romish seminary presently after its publication—is sent forth in a guise directly calculated to induce even every Oxford reader, not in Mr. Newman's confidence, to believe that he was the author; secondly, a work, even more openly Papistical, is published with Mr. Newman's disavowal of the authorship of the former volume, but under his sanction as editor; and, thirdly, here is a volume acknowledging the spiritual supremacy of Rome and the present power of St. Peter upon earth, the materials of which were supplied by a fellow of Oriel, and, we believe, pupil of Mr. Newman's. "Twelve poor fishermen sufficed to convert the world (writes the biographer of Augustine of Canterbury); and here was little England allotted forty 'fishers of men'—few labourers, indeed, for so plenteous a harvest, as men might count of few and many; but a supply far more than equal to the occasion, if we take into account the quickening power of holiness, the manifold fruits of self-denial, the intercessions of the Church, and the blessing of St. Peter."

According to this writer, a Christian bishop may do more good to his diocese by his prayers after death, than by his prayers and ministrations while in the flesh. He is speaking of the death of Luidhard, Queen Bertha's chaplain, on the eve of Pope Gregory's missionaries landing in England:—

"Was he not withdrawn in mercy at that critical juncture, to offer for the objects of his care and the partners of his zeal a more confident, more intelligent, more unembarrassed, more prevailing prayer than the hindrances of this dark and sinful state allow, and to take under the shelter of his patronage, as a glorified saint, those on whom

before he could but bestow the far feebler aid of a fellow-sinner's sympathy?"

As our attention is directed to this period of ecclesiastical history, the mission of Augustine to Saxon England, we will give a specimen of the biographer's opinion on miracles in the sixth century:—

"The Church of St. Martin's (at Canterbury) was allotted to the monks for the public celebration of religion. Here they chanted psalms, prayed, said mass, preached, and baptized. For these 'forty's sake' it pleased the divine mercy to save the city; conversions followed one another in rapid succession, till at length He who 'turneth kings' hearts as the rivers of water,' vouchsafed to Ethelbert himself the first motions of his enlightening Spirit. We have spoken of prayers, and fastings, and the silent power of holiness, as the main instruments towards this blessed result; but truth to history obliges us to take notice of another and more conspicuous spiritual weapon used, by the providence of God, in turning the hearts of the English nation to the obedience of Christ. *Those miraculous gifts, which at a somewhat later period were even profusely displayed in this island, had already begun to manifest themselves.* St. Bede, accordingly, enumerates, among the reasons which led Ethelbert to embrace the Christian faith, the 'multitude of miracles whereby the truth of the promises was accredited.' We give this statement as we find it in the pages of a most trustworthy historian, under a deep sense of the obligation resting upon us to impress, and if so be, inflict such solemn and mysterious facts upon the attention of a sceptical age, and especially in a country from which, under the joint and kindred influences of heresy and the idolatry of wealth, the spirit of child-like faith has well nigh departed."

It is quite unnecessary for us to comment upon this distinct avowal of the views of these Littlemore and Oriel writers; we will therefore resume our notice of the somewhat less objectionable life of the founder of the Cistercian order. A life of retirement from the world has alike charms for those weary of its idle pleasures and those worn out by its carking cares, and a seclusion from the distractions of business is longed for by many a fervently pious heart which would fain devote its every pulsation to heaven; but after the experience of so many ages has demonstrated how rarely these hopes have been realized in the cloister, we are astonished at the unqualified recommendation of monasticism systematically put forth in the biographical series before us. In the authentic annals of every monastic order we read of the difficulty which every founder had in retaining his immediate followers under obedience, and the next generation invariably departed from his rule; and yet Mr. Newman's unknown author deliberately writes, that "true monks everywhere

have a sort of instinct of what is the good and the right side; they have no earthly interests to dim their vision of what is God's cause; and we may trust a monk for being ever in his place—for the Church, against the world."

We suppose the writer of this panegyric would rest his defence upon the epithet "true," and say that all those who did not evince the above heavenly-mindedness were false monks; but, alas! how few "true monks" are there to be found—too few to justify a resuscitation of even the Cistercian order. The Lives before us are, however, remarkable books—full of beauties, clothed in a garb eminently attractive to the tender, the gentle, the pure, and the young; but they also abound with dangerous faults. We can linger around the ruins of Tintern, Netley, and Fountains, and remember with affectionate gratitude the blessings which their occupants conferred upon the oppressed poor of their own age; but we dare not ask, as the writer under Mr. Newman's sanction does, for the prayers of their departed abbots for blessings upon ourselves. St. Stephen Harding was an Englishman, and his character is thus summed up:—

"St. Stephen was in character a very Englishman; his life has that strange mixture of repose and of action which characterizes England. Contemplative and ascetic as he was, he was still, in his way, a man of action; he had the head to plan and the calm unbending energy to execute a great work. His very countenance, if we may trust his contemporary, the monk of Malmesbury, was English; he was courteous in speech, blithe in countenance, with a soul ever joyful in the Lord. His order seems to have thriven in St. Stephen's native air; most of our great abbeys—Tintern, Rievaulx, Fountains, Furness, and Netley, which are now known by their beautiful ruins—were Cistercian. The order took to itself all the quiet nooks and all the pleasant streams of old England, and gladdened the souls of the labourer by its constant bells. Its agricultural character was peculiarly suited to the country, though it took its birth beyond the seas. Doubtless, St. Stephen, when he was working under the hot sun of France, often thought of the harvest moon and the ripe corn-fields of his native land. *May his prayers now be heard before the throne of grace, for that dear country now lying under the wrath of God for the sins of its children.*"

A Protestant reader, before the publication of this saintly series, would scarcely have conceived it possible for a writer, under the auspices of a clergyman of the Reformed Anglican Church, thus to express himself; but we think the Papistical credulity and entire devotion to Rome displayed in the second and third volumes of the series are even greater than in the first:—

"Illuminated men feel the privileges of Christianity, and to them

the evil influence of Satanic power is horribly discernible, like the Egyptian darkness, which could be felt; and the only way to express their keen perception of it is to say, that they see upon the countenances of the slaves of sin the marks, and lineaments, and stamp of the evil one; and they smell with their nostrils the horrible fumes that arise from their vices and uncleansed heart, driving good angels from them in dismay, and attracting and delighting devils. It is said of the holy Sturme, a disciple and companion of Winfrid, that in passing a horde of unconverted Germans, as they were bathing and gambolling in a stream, he was so overpowered by the intolerable scent which arose from them that he nearly fainted away. *And no doubt such preternatural discernments are sometimes given to saints, that men may understand how exceedingly offensive a sinful man is in God's sight."*

A little girl, whose chief fault was over-fondness for play, was gaily amusing herself with a ball near the monastery, when to her great affliction she found the ball, as she caught it from her companions, stick to her hand as if glued. She ran in grief to pray at the shrine, and was freed from her fright by the ball loosening and coming away. The same reproof was thrice repeated to a woman who continued her spinning on festival days: the distaff clung to her hand. At last, being frightened out of her wilfulness, she was freed from her punishment and cured of her disobedience at Walburga's tomb.

"A person who came into the church to pray, thoughtlessly and irreverently kept his rough gauntlets or gloves upon his hands as he joined them in posture of prayer, and he felt them suddenly stripped off him and gone; he was much terrified and ashamed of his negligence, and afterwards, as he recounted what had happened to him, they appeared lying before him, restored by a miracle."

The grave comment of the Newman scribe upon these *aniles fabellæ* is—"All these have the character of a gentle mother correcting the idleness and faults of careless and thoughtless children with tenderness."

If the lives of our Saxon saints were uniformly of the puerile character indicated by the legendary nonsense we have quoted, we might safely leave them to contempt; we should not fear their infecting any mind with a passion for Popery. But there are interspersed among these idle tales some verging upon blasphemy, which we cannot pass by without our grave censure. There was never but ONE who rebuked the winds and waves, and bade them be still. St. Paul was content with commanding that those "who could swim should cast themselves first into the sea, and get to land; and the rest, some on boards, and some on broken pieces of the ship." But a Saxon lady-saint adopts a loftier course:—

"Walburga prayed to God her Saviour, and rising from prayer full of holy power, bade the elements be still. The winds and waters

heard the voice of God speaking in his servant, and obeyed, and there succeeded a miraculous calm, as if the peace and gentleness that dwelt in her bosom had spread itself like oil over the sea. Shortly they came to land, and put into port overjoyed, giving thanks to God, and regarding Walburga with veneration."

We have said that had these volumes been merely fraught with the legendary nonsense, some specimens of which we have quoted, we should have left them to contempt; neither should we have incurred the risk of bringing them under the observation of those who might peradventure, without our notice, have missed them, merely to express our condemnation of some objectionable passages, such as we cannot help considering that in which Walburga's imitation of the Saviour is recorded. But there are ever and again passages of such thrilling pathos, descriptions so picturesque, and scenes of such exquisite tenderness—the expression, moreover, of thoughts so profound, piety so ardent, and zeal so self-devoting and self-denying, that we cannot refrain from warning the young and unwary against the subtle form under which the worst errors of Popery are presented to them. Mr. Newman has been long openly charged by many of our contemporaries with disingenuousness. A reluctance to impute sinister motives to any man, and a rooted hatred to all personal attacks, have hitherto restrained us from doing more than condemn such portions of that gentleman's writings to which we entertained objections; but truth now constrains us to say, that not the most subtle and unscrupulous disciple of Loyola, who ever garbled truth or mixed a noxious compound so as to deceive the eyes of the simple, ever acted more disingenuously than Mr. Newman has done in the matter of the "Lives of the English Saints."

The Order of Daily Service, Vol. II.: containing the *Psalter*, with the *Eight Gregorian Tunes*; the *Burial Service*, with *Musical Notation*; an *Appendix of Ancient Music*, &c. London: J. Burns. 1844.

THIS volume completes the splendid and unique edition of the Common Prayer edited by Mr. W. Dyce and published by Mr. Burns, the first portion of which we had the pleasure of noticing in our number of last October. For typographical excellence, for the beauty of its wood-cut borders and initial letters, both as regards the design and execution, it is equally admirable. The editor also has enriched this portion of the work with an appendix of very curious and interesting matter relative to ancient Church music, which, in the present fast increasing taste for that very important subject, will be found well worthy of attention.

Conciones Basilicæ on the Second Advent. By T. MYERS, M.A.
London: Painter. 1844.

IN the "introduction" to these discourses the author endeavours to obviate some of the objections he foresees to his mode of interpreting Scripture, and to the doctrine of the second advent:—

"He who ventures to apply the apparatus of verbal criticism to the correction of erroneous yet prevalent opinions will be deemed a setter forth of strange novelties, while he is simply a restorer of old beliefs. It is really surprising how frequently the restoration of ancient doctrines is required in the world, and how often specious objections are ignorantly raised against them, as if they were novelties of one's own manufacture. And thus it will ever be till the time of the end. Another cause, too, why the members of our own branch of the Catholic Church are behindhand in the apprehension of the advent of Christ may be this—that their thoughts have lately been occupied with views about things, rather than with the things themselves—with abstract notions, rather than with life-sustaining realities. We have magnified differences of opinion among ourselves, rather than attempted to realize our union with the person of our Lord. I am persuaded that it will be impossible for the student to comprehend the views advocated in this small volume without previously realizing in his own experience the idea of St. Paul: 'To me to live is Christ.' (ix.)

And he also says—

"While discussing the revealed truth of God respecting the first and second advent of our Saviour, I have scrupulously refrained from enforcing a single argument which is not based on the New Testament. The Old Testament has been used by way of evidence and illustration, as necessary to suggest the method by which the New is to be interpreted, but no further." (vii.)

These observations seem intended to justify the literal understanding of our Lord's advent, and also the applying to the Jews, or the literal Israel, passages which have been often thought to refer only to the mystical Israel. One of the parables introduced into the last discourse, on the prospects of Israel, seems to acquire greater clearness and force by such a literal application:—

"The parable which implies it (the casting off of the Jews during the Gentile dispensation) most fully is that of the unjust steward; and this view gives the only solution of its moral which can be adopted as consistent. The difficulty has always been felt as to the correct interpretation of the words, 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations.' The address is clearly to Jews—the failure of their economy is predicted, and the everlasting habitations is an expression for that dwelling of God with men which was predicted under

the new covenant, when the Church should be so firmly rooted that no power throughout creation should prevail against it. The unrighteous mammon was a current expression for that disgraceful extortion which was practised by the heathen oppressors of Israel, and seems here used for the Gentiles themselves. The Jew, then, was the unjust steward. He was on the eve of hearing the alarming summons—'Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest no longer be steward.' The pride of the nation was cast down by the prospect of the depth of degradation to which they were to be humbled. Those whom they termed the unrighteous mammon were to become possessors of the everlasting habitations of God's Churches on earth; and when the Jewish polity had failed, they were to sue for admittance, through the door of repentance and faith, into the Gentile privileges." (145).

A Little Treatise demonstrating, from its Internal Evidences, the Divine Origin of the Holy Scriptures; being a Translation, from the Original Latin, of the Letter of Bochart to his Friend Le Seigneur de Tapin. With added Notes and Illustrations, and some account of the Lives of Bochart, Allix, and Lightfoot. By W. L. NEVILLE, a Clergyman of the Diocese of Lichfield. London: Painter. 1844.

VARIOUS works have been written on the internal evidence of the sacred volume; but still we hail with pleasure the appearance of this little work, inasmuch as it presents the subject to the reader in a concise form, and is a valuable addition to the testimonies already accessible to the public. The notes are rather copious, and add considerably to the value of the work. Much light is thrown by Mr. Neville on the various topics discussed in the treatise. To those who have not access to many books, this small volume will be of much value.

The History of the Church of Scotland, from the Reformation to the Present Time. By THOMAS STEPHEN. London: Lendrum. Parts 10, 11, 12, 13.

THESE four parts embrace the period from the year 1651 to 1677. The author intends to bring the history down to the present time; and we apprehend that the most interesting portion of his labours is yet to be completed. Much interest is felt, by members of the Anglican Church, in the state of Episcopacy in Scotland, from the revolution to the present period. From the manner in which Mr. Stephen has already accomplished his task, we look forward with much interest to the period to which we have alluded. The Episcopal Church of Scotland is but little known. We trust that we shall not much longer have any reason for such a complaint.

The Religious Life and Opinions of Frederick William III. King of Prussia. Translated from the German. By JONATHAN BIRCH. London: Hatchard. 1844.

It is not often that we get so near a view of a king, and very few kings, we imagine, would bear so well a close inspection. Moralists have often descanted on the temptations which environ a throne, presenting at the same time a barrier through which it is hard indeed for truth to reach the ear, and harder still to touch the heart of royalty. Frederick owed everything to the misfortunes which befel him, both as a monarch and as a man, and to those good and faithful men whom God threw in his way at the time of his greatest humiliation, and when his heart was opened to receive religious truth in the way of consolation only at the first, but thus introduced, Christianity imparted also that wisdom, firmness, and enlightened patriotism for which Frederick III. became so remarkable.

For seven years, from 1806 to 1813, Prussia and its king had to endure degradations and sufferings scarcely paralleled in modern times; and during that time, when religion seemed a matter of downright necessity to the king, in order to enable him to support existence under his many sorrows, Dr. Borowsky was thrown in his way, and in him the king found, to his great joy, a very apostle of Jesus Christ. The king himself speaks of his favourite in language such as this—

“You must picture to yourself Borowsky, as a prophet of the Old or an apostle of the New Testament; but as that may be saying rather too much, you may value him as a counterpart of those great originals. Everything about him carries the impress of his station—fertile and solid—meek and serene—artless and single-minded—genuine and candid; in him is to be seen the veritable Christian Churchman, void of distasteful affectation and pedantry. Such a man was and is my beloved Borowsky, and for that reason he is so dear to me. He stood by me, and I by him, during the dark and oppressive time, when I had need of comfort, and verily felt a yearning for consolation; but he administered no calming palliatives—his were medical remedies, even when they were harsh and occasioned pain.

“The circumstances that led to the unfortunate times, when I, my house and people, were struck down, he sought not to gloss with opiate excuses, but frankly laid bare the fundamental causes, and placed them in their true colours before my eyes, not sparing me.

“He made me conversant with prophetic theology, of which I was wholly ignorant till then. He proved to me, from the world’s history and its annalled transactions, illumined by the light of Biblical prophecy, that, in conformity to the divine government of the world, a regenerated and improved people would always rise again, and that an immoral and arrogant people had ever been abased. With a serene

and inspired confidence, he announced to me better and more happy times; fully convinced that the heavy dispensation that had befallen our country, if well turned and bravely borne, would prove the means and way to greater prosperity than ever.

"If, in those awful times, big with the fate of Prussia, when all appeared dark and gloomy, I doubted, and fretfully asked after the how, where, and when? the good man displayed in the most amiable manner his discontent—took hold of the button of my coat, patted me on the shoulder, shook me by the hand, and spoke with the earnestness and dignity of a Nathan—'You must learn to believe. It happens to man according to his faith.' All this was factly and personally new to me; so had I never been addressed before. Such was the conduct of this peculiarly excellent man towards me in every situation; even when I was most dejected, and would fain have been alone, his visits were ever new and agreeable to me. I have no one so greatly to thank for my Christian knowledge and strength as that good man." (17).

The principles thus implanted and firmly rooted by adversity grew and multiplied, and brought forth fruit abundantly, until the termination of the king's life; and his last will, drawn up only a short time before his death, is a most satisfactory evidence of religion being all in all in the mind of Frederick. And his religion, being based on the Scriptures, and wrought into the mind by careful study of Luther and the Reformers, appears in everything he did or said concerning education, and morals, and affairs of State. There is much that we would gladly transcribe, but can only commend this very interesting narrative to our readers, limiting ourselves to one more extract—

"On God's blessing all depends; I hold to that truth firmly; I know it and have experienced it. In the years 1806-7-8, a heavy curse was on us, and everything miscarried. In the years 1813-14, God's blessing returned, and everything succeeded. Even the errors then committed, the repulses we experienced, the misunderstandings that occurred, the confusions which arose, fell out, through a marvellous combination of fortunate circumstances, to our advantage, and led to the most unexpected and favourable results, so much so that we were surprised and astounded. The important victory at Culm—so beneficial in its consequences—common report, indeed historical works, have attributed to my insight and orders, but the truth is quite otherwise. My ally, the Emperor Alexander, and myself, had taken our stand, on the day of the battle, on the castle-hill, near Toplitz, whence we could survey the whole field of conflict. The balance fluctuated—indeed, was inclining towards the French—when at mid-day, at the very deciding moment, General Von Kleist appeared on the heights of Nollendorf with his corps, which ensured us the victory. His arrival was by no means part of an arranged plan, but a fortunate circumstance; for, in reality, General Von Kleist was in full flight from the unfortunate affair near Dresden, followed by the French, and had constrainedly chosen the route through Bohemia, for his retreat towards

Silesia—that it was which brought him to the right spot, at the right moment, where help was needed. We knew nothing of him, neither did he know anything of us—nothing was agreed upon. That he did not make his appearance earlier, nor later, nor more to the left, nor more to the right, but at the eventful hour, in the right place for deciding the battle, was help and salvation from God. My thankfulness and joy were, therefore, more inwardly pure; and I do not feel inclined to have such sensations disturbed and spoiled, by having attributed to me that which I had no part in—to God be the honour and praise!" (94).

A Word in Season. A Series of Subjects addressed to the Flock committed to his Charge. By the Rev. J. HOOPER, Rector of Albury. Author of a Tract on "the Doctrine of the Second Advent," "The Present Crisis," &c. One vol. 12mo. London: Painter. 1844.

THE last twelve of the tracts which make up this volume have come out since the publication of our April number, and we have much pleasure in being able to speak as favourably of the whole work as we did of the first six of the tracts in this series. The subjects handled in that part of the work to which we have already directed the attention of our readers were the grand fundamentals of our faith—the Scriptures—the Trinity—the Sacraments—in which great principles of Christian verity the orthodox have always been agreed; and we had only the simple duty before us of examining whether Mr. Hooper, in his statements, came up to the standard of orthodoxy, and, finding that he did so, to express our satisfaction thereupon. But we now come to the practical application, in the following tracts, of the principles of the former six—the superstructure upon that foundation which was then laid; and in this part of the work there is room for greater diversity, and place for showing discrimination, and even originality, and yet keeping within the bounds of orthodoxy, and resting upon those first foundations which have been already laid. The very first of the tracts we are now noticing, No. VII., p. 135, explains what we mean; it begins with the necessity of faith—"without faith it is impossible to please God;" and it applies this declaration to man in all ages of the world and in every period of existence—"It was not less true in the Adamic or the Abrahamic, than it is in the Christian dispensation." And the assertion is proved by reference to the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, and the examples of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abram, &c., all of whom by faith apprehended that portion of the mystery concerning Christ and the Church which God had made known at the time when they respectively lived, and so "served him acceptably in their day and genera-

tion. But without faith they could not have pleased him. Neither can we please him without faith, it is impossible. Faith is *no new* principle with which God has endowed man. Faith is the same in every age, and by whomsoever exercised. It differs not in its *nature* in any degree. It is the same faculty reaching forth to apprehend the things of God, as he is pleased to present them to his people." (136). The object appears to be, the pressing upon all men the responsibility of believing that portion of truth which is presented to them, whatsoever it be; and to take away the subterfuge, which, by putting faith out of man's power, would virtually remove the blame of infidelity from man and cast it on God. And with the same intention the importance of regarding the spirit of man as a part of his creature constitution is insisted on—the spirit being the region in which faith operates, and likewise the seat of will, love, and those other faculties which are above the region of understanding, and are truly metaphysical, though also natural to man by creation:—

"The spirit of man is as much a part of his being by creation as his soul or body.....It is that part of man's being wherein the resemblance to God (who is a Spirit) consists, to which God can reveal himself, and which is capable of apprehending that revelation—a revelation, indeed, that the understanding cannot fathom, but without which the understanding could not be well informed, and man would become like the beasts that perish. In this intellectual age men have denied this high endowment, and instead of having faith in God, they profess to believe nothing which they cannot understand! So that they would have a *religion without mysteries!* And, to be consistent, they must deny the very being and existence of God! For who can comprehend the infinite and eternal God? How can the *finite* comprehend the *infinite*?" (138).

We must refer our readers to the volume itself for the working out of the argument, which we should only spoil by attempting to condense; but it forms the key which is necessary for opening and rendering intelligible many of the things which follow. Symbols, for instance, are regarded never as having been conventional forms, invented by man to suggest thoughts to the mind, but always as being objects selected by God, presented to the faith of man, and, through the understanding, imparting to his spirit some divine truth; and, therefore, as not having attained their end if they rest in the understanding merely, and do not reach the spirit. And two very important principles are insisted on concerning the Jewish symbols—first, that they could not attain their end of reaching spirit, and in forming faith in Christ there, until Christ himself had come to give the explanation of the symbols; and, secondly, that no one symbol can come up to, or

adequately represent, the fulness which resides in Christ alone, and of which all symbols, even if taken collectively, must fall inconceivably short: the law made nothing perfect, it was only the bringing in of a better thing:—

“As it required the whole creation to tell out God—inasmuch as he could not be fully declared by one part considered abstractedly, but by all conjointly—even so by no single type or symbol can Christ be fully revealed—all the types and shadows are necessary to set forth his glory.....So also must the prophecies be considered as a *whole*, and not in part. It was the attending to detached portions of God’s word which brought the Jews into such gross darkness at our Lord’s first coming, and which caused that rebuke to his own disciples—‘O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to have entered into his glory? And, beginning at Moses and *all* the prophets, he expounded to them in *all* the Scriptures the things concerning himself.For not one jot or tittle shall in anywise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.’ And when the Christian Church is perfected, then it will be seen that the *heavenly* things answer to the *earthly*, as the substance does to the shadow.” (147).

The title of this tract is “Earthly and Heavenly Things”—a title derived from St. Paul’s Epistle to the Hebrews, in which portion of the inspired volume we are taught that the earthly tabernacle which Moses was instructed to build was, in all its parts, but a shadow of the heavenly realities of the Christian Church—the temple of God which Christ would build, and order as the Son over his own house, and use as the Head of his body, the Church, and send to bear witness for him to the world, even as he came to bear witness for the Father. And sure we are that this is the only rational and satisfactory way of studying symbols—to take them in that sense which St. Paul and the other inspired writers have given to them, and to reject the fanciful interpretations of men, however ingenious.

The subjects which follow in natural order are, justification by faith, our righteousness under the Gospel, the constitution of the Church, and the Sabbath; all which are properly doctrinal subjects. And in treating of the Sabbath a difference is shown in the character of the Sabbath, as instituted by God on the seventh day of creation, and as re-instituted or re-enforced at the giving of the law and in commemoration of deliverance from the Egyptian bondage; inferring that the Lord’s-day partakes more of the joyous festal character of the first or creation Sabbath, than of the constraint and bondage common to all the legal ordinances. Mr. Hooper also endeavours to show, and we think successfully, that as a change was introduced into all computations of time, in order to distinguish the Israelites from the surrounding nations, this change had the effect of throwing back

their Sabbath to Saturday, Sunday being really the day of the creation Sabbath, and as such retained among the heathen. Of course it is assumed that this was done by the appointment of God, and in preparation for another change which would be required in the Christian dispensation, when, by the resurrection of Christ, the Lord's-day would become the Sabbath, and would thus revert to Sunday, and produce a coincidence in time, as well as in character, between the creation and the Christian Sabbath.

The experiences and prospects of the Church occupy the remaining tracts, all of which are excellent, but are full of matter which does not admit of abridgment. As might be inferred from what we have already said, Mr. Hooper understands the prophetic Scriptures literally, and contends for the doctrines of the second advent and the establishing of Christ's kingdom upon the earth. But there is nothing approaching to controversy in these tracts; they are the simple but unambiguous declarations of a man who himself believes the things which he propounds for the belief of others. Yet it is manifest that very considerable pains have been taken to examine all that has been written on the subject, and to come at the real truth. And in the last of these tracts, on the "Nearness of the Lord's Advent," the writings of Faber, Cuninghame, and those who have turned their attention to the time when the prophecies referring to the close of the Christian dispensation shall have their accomplishment, have evidently been consulted, and from them the inference is drawn that we are approaching very near the end. The French revolution is regarded as the great landmark, or the point which has conduced most towards settling prophetic chronology—the 1,260 prophetic years of Daniel and St. John terminating with that shock, and so fixing not only that most prominent period, but all the other periods which depend upon or are connected with it—by all these writers. And all that think so must hold the end to be very near indeed—must regard our continuance as only a lengthening for a little while of the day of grace—an existence only by sufferance, as it were, till the world's iniquity shall be full. And in the fear that the speculation even on the nearness of the advent may turn attention from diligent preparation and constant watchfulness, Mr. Hooper closes with the exhortation—

"Let us dread a mere *theory*: let *ours* be the religion of the *heart*—an experimental and a practical manifestation of the life and power of godliness, remembering always that doctrine is profitable only so far as it leads to God—that it is good only as a means to an end, and that that end is God." (498).

A Defence of the Ancient British Church. In Reply to certain Errors intended to be received as Truths by the Author of the "Life of St. Austin." Edited under the superintendence of the Rev. H. J. NEWMAN. By a WELSH CLERGYMAN. London: Painter. 1844.

A FEW short years ago, and we should have regarded this work as one of supererogation, a superabundant effort to prove a point already sufficiently clear to all educated minds—the existence of an apostolical branch of Christ's Universal Church in England long before the landing of Pope Gregory's missionary on the shores of the Isle of Thanet. The appearance, however, of a series of Papistical biographies, which we have noticed in another portion of our reviewing department, shows that the labours of the "Welsh Clergyman" are not superfluous. The writer of the "Life of St. Augustine of Canterbury, Apostle of the English," does not indeed venture to deny the existence of a British Church before Augustine's arrival, but he so disparages its purity and laboriousness as to invest the Roman missionary's preaching with the character of a first visit to an entirely Pagan population. It has been for many ages the pleasant belief of many pious and learned Englishmen, that the great Apostle of the Gentiles himself bore the glad tidings of salvation to our heathen forefathers; and those who were not satisfied of this fact, still believed that some of St. Paul's or St. Peter's companions first sowed the seeds of Christianity in Britain; but Mr. Newman's anonymous workmen designate Pope Gregory "the spiritual father of England," and treat all prior labours as of little moment. The monkish legends which are repeated in the "Life of St. Augustine of Canterbury" with the utmost gravity, and occasionally in a tone of rebuke, because a sceptical generation will no longer recognize them as worthy of belief, are ably examined by the "Welsh Clergyman" in the little pamphlet before us. His obvious familiarity with the language, literature, and antiquities of Wales well qualified him for the task he undertook, which, in our opinion, he has satisfactorily performed.

Confirmation: Scriptural, Apostolical, Primitive. Being the substance of a Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Kettering, Northamptonshire. By C. H. Bingham, M.A., Curate, late of Caius Coll., Cambridge. London: Painter.

A SENSIBLE, orthodox exposition of the sacred ordinance of confirmation, well fitted to explain its character.

THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, MDCCCXLIV.

- ART. I.—*The Scriptural Evidence of the Apostolic Ministry, and Tradition of the Church Catholic.* By HENRY PHIBBS FRY, A.B., of St. George's, Hobart Town, Van Diemen's Land. Printed at the "Advertiser" Office. 1843.
2. *Notes on the Episcopal Polity of the Holy Catholic Church. With some Account of the Development of the Modern Religious Systems.* By THOMAS WILLIAM MARSHALL, B.A., Curate of Swallowcliffe and Ansty, in the Diocese of Salisbury. London: Burns. 1844.
3. *Dialogus Divi Johanni Chrysostomi de Sacerdotio. The Treatise of John Chrysostom on the Priesthood.* Translated by EDWARD G. MARSH, M.A., Canon of Southwell, and Vicar of Aylesford. London: Seeley. 1844.
4. *Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche.* Wittenburg: Rich. Rothe. 1837.

WE believe that it has not been from anything like thorough conviction that persons have been induced to join themselves to the Church of Rome, in these days; nor from a preference arrived at by deliberate examination of the opposed doctrines of Protestants and Papists; neither has it arisen altogether from a predetermination to slight the Reformers—that so many, in these last days, have seemed to be straying in the direction of Rome; but it has rather arisen from the agitation of questions which had not been presented under the same aspect during the time of the Reformation, and were not fairly grappled with in

the writings of the Reformers, yet which had been discussed among the multifarious controversies of the Roman Church, and have been there decided in her usual dogmatical way. It is a relief to some minds to find that others have been troubled in the same way as themselves; and hope is excited by hearing that the questions have been decided. And even if it should be perceived that matters were not finally settled, and that such questions could not be satisfactorily decided in this dogmatical way, yet it would be a relief to find that they had been entertained, and any discussion of them would hold out a hope that out of it something might arise which would enable us to advance further than they did towards a true determination of such questions: even if it should not be in our power completely and finally to settle them, we might get somewhat nearer the truth, and might be somewhat more at ease.

The Reformers found the Church in a dungeon dark as Erebus, in which for centuries she had been imprisoned. They had enough, and more than enough, to occupy all their thoughts in the great practical work which lay before them. They were men struggling for life; they were making way for the Church to breathe once more the fresh air of heaven, and look again upon the glorious sun from beneath that load of corruption which had weighed her down. *That was not a time for speculation*, nor had they the leisure to engage in it. But the questions to which we allude are speculative, yet appear simple, and when first entertained seem to involve no practical consequences, but to leave all our responsibilities and all our active duties untouched. Yet it is soon found out that they are really so complicated as to require long continued and uninterrupted attention, and to involve practical consequences little dreamt of, altering, perhaps, the whole future current of life—separating bosom friends, and, in place of reciprocations of love, planting the *odium theologicum* between them.

Many a man who has unwittingly engaged in such speculations as these, from not being aware of their difficulty, and not suspecting how incompetent he may be, for want of some previous training, is so taken by surprise as to be overpowered by the confidence and apparent mastery of the Roman casuists. He is secretly glad to relieve himself from any further anxiety on subjects which he has found to be beyond his reach; and discovering that they have already been entered into by Rome, and discussed with great subtlety, and very authoritatively decided, he yields to that authority, and concedes the point from which every other concession must follow. Rome becomes his mistress, and whatsoever Rome decides or commands becomes law to him.

In settling such questions, the writings of the fathers afford us very little available help, simply because the Church had not then arrived at such a condition of extent or general recognition as to give rise to such questions as those which are especially Papal. And the other more general questions, such as those concerning apostolic succession, episcopacy, or tradition, were then matters of fact, and not of opinion. They needed no discussion in order to ascertain the meaning or limits of these things; they had the things subsisting in living men, deriving their authority from the first founders of our faith—they had no such questions, and therefore help us little therein.

The early Church could scarcely have formed a conception of some of the questions which most deeply agitate us: and even the Reformers, if they could have turned from the great practical work in which they were engaged, and could have commanded the leisure necessary for such discussions as these, were scarcely in a condition to understand how they could ever assume the importance which they have since attained, so as to treat them as questions in which the Church had a direct and immediate interest. They were struggling for existence—to be let alone was their great desire; they were but too happy in having nothing to do with Rome; they thought not of instituting a comparison between themselves and Rome in these matters, since they had them only in common with Rome, and had brought out whatsoever they had from thence, or rather from that one Catholic Church of which they regarded themselves to have been, and still continuing to be, a vital and integral part. Such of the reformed as had bishops among them gladly continued the Episcopal succession, rejoicing in their good fortune; such as had not, should rather be compassionate as having been precluded from that advantage by adverse circumstances more than by choice, and as objects for condolence, not subjects of contumely and reproach.

There are, we repeat it, questions now arising for the solution of which the past history of the Church furnishes no sufficient parallel. They are far deeper than any that occurred at the time of the Reformation—far more spiritual than those which first divided the Greek and Latin Churches, and still keep them asunder—far more difficult and complicated than any of those questions which had arisen in the earlier and simple ages of Christianity. They are wide as the purpose of God—deep as the very foundations of the Church: and they are questions which will be more and more forced upon us, and which we must prepare ourselves to answer in a satisfactory manner. It is a time of trial—it is a call for the exercise of faith—it is a

crisis requiring each one of us to be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. "Deep calleth unto deep, at the noise of thy water-spouts (may now be the language of the Church). All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me. Yet the Lord will command his loving-kindness in the day time, and in the night his song shall be with me, and my prayer unto the God of my life. Why art thou cast down, O my soul! and why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God, for I shall yet praise him, who is the health of my countenance and my God."

The right apprehending of apostolical succession and of the standing of the Christian priesthood lies at the foundation of all the questions to which we have alluded, being a right understanding of all that is included in the article, "*I believe one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.*" Every community, every congregation of Christians professes to explain it, and assumes that they are unquestionably of the Church. Each portion of the Church thus explains the article in its own favour, and in so doing virtually excludes the other portions of the Church; each would give a different definition of the article, and becomes itself excluded by other definitions; and the Catholic Church, which is theoretically asserted to be everywhere, is found to be practically recognized nowhere. For the Greek Church, pluming itself on its sole orthodoxy, cuts off the whole Latin Church; and those who hold of St. Peter claim to be the only Apostolic Church, and cut off all others: the Protestants, making holiness the mark of the Church, abjure Rome as full of corruption and deadly error; and Rome, glorying in its unity, regards all who are not in communion with her as out of the pale of salvation. Yet there is a sense in which all these parties are, up to a certain point, Catholic, having been constrained, by the unvarying and universal voice of the Church, to regard BAPTISM as the only visible and ostensible mark of separation between the Church and the world—baptism, whether by priest or layman—baptism by any Christian. And baptism, whether by Paul or his ministers, is equally valid, not being into Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, but into CHRIST: it surely places every baptized person within the pale of the Church, and under divine ordinances; and places all, in this respect, on a footing of perfect equality.

The beginning of our Church existence—the commencement of our Christian life—can be placed nowhere else, save at baptism; and therefore it is only to the baptized, only to those who are thus brought into the Church, that the questions we speak of are of any importance, or can be made, properly speaking,

intelligible. To the natural man, St. Paul tells us, they are foolishness; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But to those who are in the Church they are questions of the deepest import; their growth in Christ, their knowledge of the ways of God, their strength to overcome the temptations and snares with which we are beset, the spiritual weapons for the Christian warfare, and the power to wield those arms as good soldiers of Jesus Christ, are thus attained, and only thus legitimately, and in the fullest and highest sense. The ordinances of the Church are God's appointed instruments for perfecting his children; but they must be known, and valued, and diligently appropriated by those who would have the blessing. Where the ordinances are wanting, or where they are suffered to languish, there cannot be the fulness of the blessing; and they will languish unless both ministers and people are continually alive to their importance. It will not suffice to be told "Depart in peace, be you warmed and filled." There must be intelligent faith, both in ministers and people, to fill the ordinances and to extract the blessings they contain; and therefore the discussion of these things is so important, in order that there may be intelligent faith in the Church.

But there is a grace indispensably necessary for the profitable discussion of these things—the grace of charity; that grace of which St. Paul speaks as rejoicing not in iniquity, but rejoicing in the truth; without which, understanding and knowledge, and faith itself, are profitless and vain. (1 Cor. xiii.) Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth; and this charity must be equally shown towards all. There was a time when it was chiefly on behalf of the Romanists that we had to call for the exercise of charity in England. But a school has now sprung up amongst us, the tendencies of which are all in the direction of Rome, who are more than charitable towards her, and look upon her with partiality; and it is now necessary to warn them against uncharitable feelings towards their Protestant brethren, to whose many excellencies Roman prejudice has blinded them; and, above all, to warn them against their parricidal rage against the Reformation, as a whole—a rage which is tolerated by Protestant England, only because it is compassionated. It is sometimes asserted that it is of no importance by what names things are called; that if the thing is really good, a bad name will, by being applied to a good thing, lose its old signification, and henceforward become a term of commendation, instead of a term of reproach. If it were so, language would long ago have ceased to convey any definite meaning, and in writing a history of different ages men would need running notes and a perpe-

tual commentary, to explain the sense in which names of the most important principles, and parties, and things, are to be understood at one time or at another time, and to say whether the name denoted, at that time, a good or a bad thing. We believe there will be found to be more truth in an opposite assertion, derived from the old proverb, "Give a dog an ill name, and you may as well hang him;" and that the surest way of bringing anything into contempt and odium is to give it a bad name, or so to use its own name as that it shall never be mentioned but with feelings and associations of dislike, animosity, hatred, and disgust. A party has arisen amongst us who are constantly and systematically thus dealing with the names "Protestant" and "Reformation"—time-honoured words in these lands; generic appellations for England's whole being and prosperity; names which include, under these general terms, our independence—our religion—our morals—our HOMES. To say nothing of the *national* blessings which have resulted from these, and which have made our constitution, and wealth, and power the wonder and also the envy of the world.

One of the books which we have put at the head of this article affords evidence of this want of charity; the writer is continually falling into this narrow sectarian bigotry, and using "Protestantism" as a term of reproach. But we pass by this littleness with these general remarks, assured that such folly will soon wear itself out, or be put down by the universal voice of Protestant England. And we use these books only as affording the best groundwork we know of, among recent publications, for the remarks which we have to make; and we will begin with some account of the books themselves.

We regard the first of these works as a great curiosity; it is far the best treatise that has come under our notice, from the Tractarian school, on these very difficult subjects; full of learning and information of the right kind; yet printed in Van Diemen's Land, and at a newspaper office, on common paper, with battered types, a slender assortment of capitals and italics, and no fount at all of Greek, so that Greek quotations are of necessity omitted, and the few Greek words which are indispensable to the argument come in, shorn of all their grace, in vile Roman—like some unfortunate wight caught by an Union barber, and turned out ridiculously with shorn locks and in prison garb. Mr. Fry's book has stuff and vigour enough to pass through this ordeal unscathed; and we believe that all those whose opinion is worth having, and for whom Mr. Fry ought to care, will disregard these accidental things, and think the better of him for disregarding them. We take the homely appearance of the

book rather as a sign of good sense and straightforwardness in the author, who takes things as he finds them ; and this opinion of the man is quite borne out by the whole style and manner of the book, which is as remarkable for clearness of thought and simplicity of expression as for the homeliness of its typography and outward appearance. The work, as may be inferred from the title, proceeds from the Tractarian school, but from one who has been separated from it when in a comparatively healthy state, and while sincere attachment to their mother Church, and hearty protestation against the errors of Rome, still subsisted amongst them, as a body ; for we can discover nothing in this work which resembles those doctrines which Mr. Palmer, and those who agree with him, found it necessary to disclaim ; nor do we find any tendency towards those absurdities of the dark ages which some of them have attempted to revive, and which, by their introduction, have recently made subjects, which ought surely to be the opposite of everything trifling and the antidote of everything frivolous, provocatives of nothing but ridicule—themselves purely and supremely ridiculous. We heartily wish that those indolent college fellows, who listlessly pore over the black-letter manuscripts of the dark ages till they have imbibed the very spirit of twichild imbecility which, in those ignorant, dreamy, monkish times, stole over and well-nigh swamped the Church, and which they give vent to in the reprint of lying legends, which they themselves have not the face to accredit, and which they print in trumpery covers adorned with children's pictures, and bespangled with crosses of gold within and without—we heartily wish that they were cast into some such region of common-sense reality as that of Mr. Fry. We wish that they knew what MEN are thinking and doing—what MEN want ; and that they would write with the earnestness and simplicity of ambassadors of Christ, charged with his high commission, and surrounded by multitudes who have a right to demand of them certainties, and heavenly verities, at all times ; and at the present time, seasonable truths, upon which they may act in the most important of all concerns, and at the most momentous crisis that has ever occurred in the history of the Church. Were they once awakened to common sense and common feeling, they would not have the effrontery to put us off with a monkish legend, or doubtful speculation, or subtle distinction of the schoolmen—all dreamy amusements of idleness ; but they would feel as men, and give attention to the wants and trials of the men around them, and sacrifice their own feelings, and devote themselves to the good of others, instead of being wrapt up in their own narrow thoughts, and engrossed in the sole care of themselves.

Mr. Fry feels alive to his own duties and to the wants of those around him, and uses the Catholic principle, which he holds in common with the other Tractarians, only as a motive for greater activity and further exertions; beginning his Introduction with the assertion, that "every truth is a valuable acquisition, important in proportion to its moral and practical effects;" and he closes the Introduction, after stating the principle which he means to develope, with the following words:—

"As a religious principle, if true, its effects are most extensive and powerful. If there be one Catholic and Apostolic Church, it is the most practical of all truths; for belief in it is the adoption of a positive prescribed rule of faith, life, and worship, on sacred authority, which it is a religious duty to obey and fulfil, without deviation or dispute; and as no doctrine is more practically important, so none is more exposed to objections and rejection, from the pride of reason, insubordination, or love of indulgence. Those who have rejected this truth, if it be a truth, are involved in the greatest possible difficulty, and have almost insurmountable obstacles to contend against. It must, therefore, be by a most especial grace and blessing of God that this truth can be recovered by those who have cast it from them. Indeed, this principle, if it be scriptural, is above all truths; for it includes all truths, and keeps from error, in faith or worship, those who receive it faithfully..... He knows how easy it is to heap up objections..... But if the confidence of a single member of the Church is by his means strengthened in the conviction that the Church exists now as Christ's institution, in the possession and exercise of the authority and graces which it enjoyed by the Lord's gift in the time of the apostles, he will not esteem his labour misapplied. If there should be any willing to receive and obey the Apostolic Church as the Redeemer's institution for the guidance of his people in his faith and service, but unable to overcome objections, or see it as positively proved and declared in Scripture, let them remember, that 'if any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.' And that by devout and penitent fulfilment of the devotion of the Apostolic Church, with humble prayer and enquiry, they shall know the truth of God, who resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble, and light to them that sit in darkness, to guide their feet into the way of peace."

Mr. Fry makes the Epistle to the Ephesians his text (iv. 11, 14), in which the provisions for perfecting the Church in faith and doctrine are declared. He assumes, that as from Christ these provisions proceed, so in the glory of Christ they issue, and shall find their full and final accomplishment; and that, in the meantime, each member of the Church finds the provision meant for him, and fulfils his part of the common duty of all, by knowing his place in the body, and laying hold by faith of the grace proper to that place—whether as teaching, or as being taught—whether for doctrine, or reproof, or exhortation; and

that to divide the word of God is to apply the infinite sufficiency of Christ to all our spiritual needs; and that there are no vain speculations nor useless institutions in the Gospel.

“Rightly, therefore, to divide the word of God, is to apply the doctrines of the Gospel, each separately, to its peculiar end, as the means, under grace, by which the soul receives a spiritual blessing of Christ; and to point out the peculiar blessings which the institutions of the Gospel, as means of grace, are designed to convey to the faithful and submissive.” (p. 3).

This is really the important point, to distinguish between things that differ, and yet to see Christ to be the all in all. Not to suppose that there is but one doctrine in Christianity, because St. Paul said, “I was determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified.” Not to limit the Gospel to one single idea, and call the entertaining another idea an abandonment of the Gospel. But to regard the Gospel as being good news for all men, under all circumstances—glad tidings to the despondent, from whatever cause; as being, in short, a provision of the infinite wisdom and grace of God for the countless wants and sorrows of fallen man—wide as the human race, embracing all in its amplitude; yet specific and exact, to meet and satisfy the case of each, as if all were prepared and intended for that single soul. It is like the old definition of the being of God—it is like a circle, whose centre is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere.

In the Gospel each man may find a full provision for his own case; and if he is wise he will take it at once, and rejoice in the blessing, neither stinting himself by generating doubt, through complicating his case with that of another man, nor giving way to uncharitable thoughts of others, by insisting that they ought to pass through the same course of experience as himself. In the general provisions of the Gospel, designed alike for all men, there is a suitability and adaptation to the natural character of each individual, and to the peculiar circumstances in which he may be found. But it is in the sacraments, and in the ministry, that this distinguishing between things that differ becomes most important, so as to give ourselves entirely, and with undivided attention, at any one time, to the thing which is then in hand, and so derive from it the full measure of blessing; and not be like men distracted, halting between two opinions, or else, in dreamy stupor, having none but vague ideas, and thus in danger of becoming the passive instruments of any violent impulse.

The sacraments are precise and definite in their provisions, each being instituted to impart its own peculiar blessing, which cannot be received but through the appointed channel. In bap-

tism we are represented as buried with Christ, and raised from the dead, and seated with him in the heavens—as raised to newness of life, and that life everlasting; therefore, in this sacrament alone, and fully in this, God makes us partakers of the benefits of the cross of Christ, and of his resurrection and ascension into heaven. And as Christ died once, and then ever liveth, so the sacrament which imparts this blessing to us, imparts it completely—it cannot be repeated; the responsibility of walking in newness of life rests equally on all the baptized, though the consequences thereof may not appear until the judgment-day, when those who have forfeited the place in the Church which was given them in baptism will die the second death.

Christian baptism is not to be confounded with that of John, or any similar washings of mere purification, either before the coming of Christ or after. When any were found who had only received John's baptism of repentance (Acts xix. 4), such were baptized into Christ; and this Christian baptism made them partakers of all the benefits of Christ's passion and resurrection—of all his vicarious work—of all that he had done for us. But there was not only a vicarious work to be done for us, but a mediatorial work towards us and in us, to perfect us, and make us meet for the service of God, and that new standing to which we are brought by the sacrament of baptism. The vicarious work was done once for all by Christ Jesus, and his one sacrifice for the sins of the whole world; and it is applied once for all to each one of us in baptism. But his mediatorial work is continuous, and must be continuous in each one of us; and therefore another sacrament, of continuous operation, is instituted in the Church, not to repeat anything done in baptism, but to bring out its fruits and consequences—to sustain the new life, it is true, but more especially in order to impart to those who have the new life, as members of the body of Christ, that very mind of Christ, and those powers of the world to come, which may enable them to glorify God, by bearing a faithful witness for him before all men. If the first sacrament had imparted all we need, the second would not have been instituted; and if the second conferred all, the first would not have continued to be an indispensable preliminary to the second; but each has its peculiar blessings, and therefore neither can be omitted.

When Christ was about to return to the bosom of the Father, he charged his disciples not to begin their work of building the Church until they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost, or endued with power from on high. (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4, 5). And when he ascended up on high, he gave gifts unto men for the work of the ministry—for the edifying of the Church. (Eph.

iv. 12). But the work of the ministry, and the edifying of the body of Christ, might be summed up in the acts of rightly administering the sacraments, and taking care that the people understand their meaning, and so rightly receive them; for it is by the sacraments that the blessings are imparted, and the communication between Christ and his Church is kept up—the priests are but the hands to which the sacraments are committed, and the ministers who are charged to take care that the people properly receive them; and therefore it can be asserted that “the unworthiness of the ministers hinders not the effect of the sacraments.” (Art. xxvi.) But it would be monstrous to assert that defect in the sacraments is remedied by the worthiness of those who administer them. Yet the sacraments will be defective, unless those who have charge of them know what is contained in them, and teach it to the people: nay, they may be most perilous—men may eat and drink damnation to themselves, through not discerning the Lord’s body. (1 Cor. xi. 29). Therefore our Lord, in his last words to his apostles, charged them—“Go ye, *teach* all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: *teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.” (Matt. ult.) Teaching *precedes* and accompanies the first sacrament; teaching *other things* prepares for the second sacrament. To those who thus teach, and thus administer the sacraments, the promise of the abiding presence of Christ is made; and we see not how any, who are not implicitly obeying these commandments, can take to themselves the promise of the abiding presence of Christ.

Two acts of teaching are required, and for persons in two very different conditions—for those who are not yet brought into the Church, and who need to be informed what baptism means, and what the Church is; and then for those who have been brought into the Church, and should be instructed in the spiritual and divine mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. These acts of teaching ought to be kept distinct, and were kept distinct in the early Church, when the catechumens were separated from the believers, and each class had its own teachers; and it is one of the greatest difficulties now, when there is but one class of teachers and one class of auditors in the Church, so to shape the teaching as to be a benefit to all—to be elementary enough for those who are, in fact, catechumens, yet spiritual enough for those who ought to be believers; and the effect of this anomalous state of things has been to neutralize teaching, so as to take away its distinctive character and render it com-

paratively powerless for either of its purposes. In the first planting of Christianity the two acts of teaching were necessarily distinct—the first being committed to evangelists, who, like Philip at Samaria, preached Christ unto the people, and baptized them (Acts viii.); who were then followed by apostles or elders, laying hands on the baptized (viii. 17), confirming the churches (xv. 41), delivering them the decrees for to keep that were ordained of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. And so were the Churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily. (xvi. 5).

In Christian lands, where children are baptized in infancy, this preliminary instruction is committed to the parents and sponsors, with occasional catechizing by the clergy; and when it is completed, they, in like manner, pass under the hands of the bishop, and are thus admitted to the table of the Lord. But this elementary instruction would be still better given if it were, as in primitive times, altogether in the hands of the clergy, and of a class of the clergy devoting themselves entirely to what may be called elementary instruction—the work of the evangelist, or simple preaching of the Gospel. This work had been almost entirely neglected in the ages preceding the Reformation; and the foundations not being laid at all, or quite out of course, the whole Church was, as a breach, ready to fall, swelling out on a high wall, whose breaking cometh suddenly at an instant. (Isa. xxx. 18). The Reformed Churches, in remedying this evil, have gone into the other extreme, and not only made all their teaching too elementary for those who are already admitted to the Lord's table, but disconnecting the discourse and the sacrament, and so seldom discoursing at all concerning that awful mystery, which was the all in all of religion to the primitive Church.

In early times the consecration of the elements, and the instruction, by means of which the hearts of the faithful were enlarged to receive the full blessing contained in the holy mystery of the body and blood of the Lord, were both in the hands of the bishop; so that Ignatius (Ep. ad Smyrn.) regards a bishop's presence or sanction as indispensable to the sacramental act; and Ambrose regards teaching as the peculiar office of the bishop. "*Episcopi proprium munus docere populum: de off sac.*" And there are good grounds for believing that there was but one place of consecration in each diocese at first, and that the consecrated elements were sent from the cathedral, or house, to the dependent houses, parishes, or congregations, to be distributed amongst those who, owing to numbers or distance, could not come up to the episcopal table. The breaking bread from house to house (Acts ii. 46) was probably of this kind—it can

hardly mean privately, which would be *κατ' ιδίαν*; but their places of assembly were necessarily private houses, and none of these could contain a very large congregation; therefore the apostles went from one such congregation to another, breaking bread from house to house. But circumstances were so different then, that we cannot take the Acts of the Apostles for guidance, in all respects, concerning this. For they *worshipped* in the temple, where they could not partake the sacrament, and took the sacrament in their houses, having already worshipped publicly in the temple. We worship and take the sacrament in the same place, at the same time. But we may learn what were the things which the apostles considered their especial duties, in their saying, "We will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." (vi. 4). "Continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house." (ii. 46). "And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ." (v. 42). And this example of the apostles the bishops continued to follow for many ages.

Mr. Fry shows (page 34) that our Lord commissioned two orders of preachers—evangelists, the seventy, to prepare the way—apostles, the twelve, to complete the work; to build, and set in order, and govern. To both orders miraculous powers were given to attest their heavenly mission; but the apostles had a higher kind of teaching to impart, from being ever near the Lord, and being made acquainted with all his mind. And to the apostles alone was committed the government of the Church, and the power of binding and loosing; and this over the whole Church, indicated by their laying hands on all for admission to communion; while by ordination to the ministry, and power to administer the sacraments, or exercise any function in the Church proceeding from them alone, they were virtually constituted guardians of faith and doctrine in the Church. "It is in their ministerial office and government of the Church that the peculiar appointment of the apostles consisted." (p. 36). But then, as Mr. Fry justly argues, the Church would always need government, and an authority similar to that conferred upon the apostles must continue in the Church; and that this authority has devolved upon the bishops of the Church, as successors of apostles, and who were at first even named apostles, although this name has since been restricted to the twelve.

"We see how important and even essential to the well-being, if not existence of the Church, the ministerial offices conferred by our Lord upon the apostles were. These functions are conferred on them in *general language*, together with the authority of our Lord himself.

They were empowered to govern his Church, and to administer those ordinances which he had constituted as the means of conferring his spiritual graces upon the people. The permanent nature of the duties they were commissioned to fulfil affords the strongest reason to conclude that the office to which these duties were attached was designed to be equally permanent; otherwise it is difficult to suppose that our Saviour would have given us intimation of the nature of the ministry and government of his Church in all ages. Our Lord's last words to his apostles, as recorded by St. Matthew—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world"—is a positive declaration of the perpetuity of their office; for His presence is promised with them in their making disciples of all nations, and baptizing them in the name of the Holy Trinity. It is with them in performing the ministerial office which he sends them to execute, that he promises to be present. That office was to continue for ever, and his promised presence is for ever." (p. 37).

This reasoning appears to us conclusive for the continuance of apostolic authority in the Church, and for regarding bishops as apostles' successors, and for calling those Churches apostolic which are in the hands of those who can claim commission, by uninterrupted succession, from the first apostles. But it becomes necessary here to guard against a mistake which Mr. Fry has made, in supposing that the name of "apostle," whensoever given, carried with it all that was at first implied in the bestowal of that name by our Lord—all that belonged to the first twelve, to whom, by common consent of the Church, the name of "the apostles" has been exclusively restricted. This mistake in Mr. Fry's book only comes in by the way, and does not materially affect his argument; but in Mr. Marshall's book it forms the prominent feature. It is put forward in the first page, it forms the whole basis of his argument, and spoils what might otherwise have been a very good book.

Mr. Fry only states it by the way, and, we suspect, reasons too clearly not to perceive that such an idea, if carried out, goes beyond the Papacy in extravagance, investing every bishop's chair with that authority which the Romanists claim for the chair of St. Peter. If St. James, not being one of the twelve, but appointed Bishop of Jerusalem by the twelve, became, by virtue of that appointment, an apostle, superior to the twelve, and entitled to preside in their councils as being a bishop, this is not only making an apostle *chosen of men* to be superior to the apostles *of Jesus Christ*, but it is running counter to the whole argument that *apostles* are the governors of the Church, and that bishops *succeed* to their authority. It supposes bishops to be a *distinct*, a newly-created order; and, though created by *apostles*, supposes them to be *superior* to those that made them.

Persons should tell us plainly what they mean. Are apostles' *successors* like the twelve? Because if they are, we are entitled to require the same credentials—that each may be able to say, “Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen the Lord?” And, “Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.” Or are they vice-apostles, bearing the same relation to apostles which viceroy does to a king? This is Hammond's view, who calls them *secondary* apostles. But as Cade said that Henry should be king, but he would be viceroy *over* him, so there are some now who would make apostles' successors an order above that of apostles, though constituted by them. And this is, in fact, the absurdity of Papacy; they make the Pope to be Christ's vicar on earth—not St. Peter's vicar, not any apostle's vicar, but successor to a bishop whom they have already feigned to be prince of apostles, and superior to all the rest. This mistake is bad enough in Rome, but in Mr. Marshall it is far more absurd. He makes every bishop such a vicar—every bishop of an order superior to that of apostles, although deriving authority from them. St. James, he argues, was not one of the twelve, but St. James had most marked and distinguished precedency in all things; but history tells us he was Bishop of Jerusalem, and he is often called an apostle—therefore his precedency and apostleship are owing to his having been made a bishop; and these distinctions are inherent in, and inseparable from, the episcopal office. The argument means this, or it means nothing at all, and the book is just so much waste paper.

The fundamental error lies in the supposition that a stream can rise higher than its source; and it inculcates the radical abomination, that authority may ascend from a lower to a higher order, instead of holding fast the principle that all power is from above—that it must come from God, and cannot be assumed or created by man. The Father committed all power to the Son. Christ committed all authority in the Church to the apostles—to the twelve, as one body, not to one alone, or to one for the rest. The apostles transmitted this authority to bishops; the same authority, we grant, but not greater, and not so great in one respect, since an apostle's authority is universal—is the same wherever he might be; but a bishop's authority is only of force within his own diocese—he may not interfere with another bishop's diocese, except with his permission. A bishop's ordination and a bishop's orders are good everywhere; but this is not the point. And if an apostle should have shown deference to a bishop, and set a good example of upholding the authority of the bishop, this is not the point, and is no more than what a

bishop would do in the parish of one of his clergy. The bishop, we believe, does not use the pulpit in his own cathedral without the consent of the dean, but no one would dream of arguing that the dean is over the bishop.

Mr. Marshall's work shows considerable research, but we fear that he does not well know what he is doing. His argument begins badly ; he takes up a false position, and, as if conscious that it is untenable, says that it makes no difference to his argument whether it be true or false. " That this St. James was not one of the twelve apostles is commonly asserted by the authorities, both ancient and modern." And he quotes, in a note, Hammond and Salmasius—adding, " Not, however, that our reasonings depend upon this, one way or the other." (p. 29). This is absurd ; for if his reasonings depend not upon it, why take such a position, and why fill his notes with extracts intended to make it good ? The fact concerning James might not be very important in the argument of Hammond, who regards bishops as secondary apostles ; and so might be immaterial to Mr. Marshall's, if he took the same line of argument as other Episcopalians, and only sought to put the episcopacy in its true place, and maintain it there. But it does make a very great difference in his argument, which endeavours to put the episcopacy in a false place, making it really and virtually the worst form of Presbyterianism—the highest elders in the Church creating one superior to themselves out of the simple disciples—making one who was not even their equal, who was not an apostle, greater than all the twelve, and this one who was called distinctively " James the Less ! " But Mr. Marshall appears unconscious of the distinction between apostolic *authority*, derived immediately from Christ, and apostolic *succession*, which implies that apostles have intervened for transmitting Christ's authority to those who shall succeed them in the place of rule. Yet, odd as it may appear, it is true that Mr. Marshall is so little aware of its being necessary to his argument, that many of his authorities and admissions refute and negative this fundamental assumption, that James was not one of the twelve ; as Papias, quoted page 40, who says that the father of James was Cleophas, or *Alphæus* ; which is equivalent to saying that he was one of the twelve—was James the son of Alphæus, or James the Less.

We might safely leave Mr. Marshall to his own self-refutation ; but it is important to the Church that no doubt should remain on a point like this, which is one of the foundations of our faith, and tells in many ways. We will, therefore, make a few remarks upon the twelve apostles, and upon the mistake into which Hammond and some few others have fallen. They, in the too

eager desire to exalt other bishops to a level with the Bishop of Rome—as Mr. Marshall, in blind zeal for episcopacy, would exalt it above every ordinance, not only in the present, but in the primitive Church—would exalt it even above the apostolic ordinance from whence it is derived.

Mr. Marshall roundly asserts, that “the authorities, both ancient and modern,” are on his side; but he only refers to Hammond, Weisman, Salmasius, and Jerome. We make him a present of Weisman and Salmasius—they are not worth powder and shot, or rather ink and paper; and after looking at the reference in Jerome, we deny that he says any such thing *in that place*, and *in other places* says directly the contrary to it. But Jerome is no great favourite with us on such matters, as we shall have occasion to show before we finish this article; therefore Hammond is the only authority that remains. But it is necessary to quote a few sentences preceding the passage to which Mr. Marshall refers, in order that our readers may see that the case of James is introduced to show that bishops, not of their own body, were appointed by the apostles; and this may be shown from Timothy and others, when the case of James fails. But for the extravagant pretensions which Mr. Marshall has set up, the case of James is the only support, and failure in this point is fatal to those extravagant claims for episcopacy. Hammond is showing how the Church came into its present order, after it had been put into the hands of the first apostles by Jesus Christ; and he divides the subject under five several heads:—1. Of primary apostles; 2. Of those commissioned by them; 3. Of the angels in the Apocalypse; 4. On episcopacy itself, and eldership; 5. Of the office of deacons. It is under the second of these heads that the passage referred to by Mr. Marshall will be found, preceded by the following sentence:—

“Ad primum quod attinet, ex Scripturis satis clarum est, hos Christi, apostolos, totidem singulares personas, Ecclesias plantasse primum, dein rexisse, nec presentes tantum, sed et in absentia, per se, non mediante, aut intercedente semper aliquo presbyterorum collegio, administrasse.

“Secundo (this is Mr. Marshall’s reference), Primarii hi, et κορυφαιοι a Christo *immediate* vocati, et missi apostoli, alios insuper *secundarios*, seu εν δευτερεω positos, ejusdem et jurisdictionis, et nominis participes factos apostolis, miserunt; qui ecclesias etiam aut ipsi plantarent, et regerent, aut ab aliis prius plantatas (et adhuc ad curam et μεριμναν ipsorum apostolorum generali modo pertinentes, 2 Cor. xi. 28) sibi administrandas et regendas susciperent.

“Illud exemplis nonnullis confirmabitur. In primis Jacobi fratris Domini, quem inter duodecim Christi apostolos numerandum non esse, libenter Waloni largiemur, et in eum sensum Eusebii verba eis και ουτος

των φερομενων του σωτηρος μαθητων, αλλα και αδελφων ην, necessario intelligenda esse contendimus, cum μαθητας isto capite, duodecim apostolis manifeste opponi videamus. Testatur illud Menologium Græcorum, tres Jacobos, celebrans Jacobum Alphæi die 9 Oct. Jacobum frat. Dom. die 23 Oct. et Jacobum Zebedei die 30 Aprilis. Sic et Autor Recognitionum, quem Clementem non esse, ex eo (inter alia) Bellarminus concludit, quod Jacobum fratrem domini non vult esse apostolum ex duodecim."

This is about as sorry an array of authorities as we remember ever to have met with. A doubtful passage in Eusebius, a Greek calendar for which we have only Hammond's own word, and are not informed of its age or authority; and the Clementine recognitions, which Bellarmine rejected as spurious, on this very account, as being one of the many falsehoods they contain. We presume our readers will thank us for not wasting their time over such *authorities* as these, and coming at once to the point, which is this, whether James the son of Alphæus, and James the brother of our Lord, were two persons, or whether it was the same person under different names. Hammond contends for two individuals; we maintain that it was one and the same.

James the son of Alphæus is placed as ninth among the apostles by all the three evangelists; and he is so named to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee. But we find no other mention of Alphæus in Scripture, just as there is no further notice of Zebedee; but we find in St. Luke's enumeration, the eleventh apostle to be Judas, the brother of James, who is consequently the Thaddeus of Matthew and Mark. But James the son of Alphæus was also called James the Less, to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee—as in Mark xv. 40, in which passage we also learn that Mary was his mother; and from comparison with the parallel passage (John xix. 25), we learn that this Mary was sister to the blessed Virgin, and also wife of Cleophas; therefore, Alphæus, the father of James, and Cleophas, his mother's husband, are clearly the same individual. And Lightfoot and other Talmudists assure us that these two Greek words would come with equal facility from the one *Hebrew* name for this individual, as they find it in the Rabbinical writings, which, beginning with the letter Heth or Cheth, a strong aspirate, cannot be expressed in *Greek*, but would be either written Alpai or Klepai, and so pass into Alphaios, or Kleopas, and Klopas—

"Nomen hebræum est חַלְפַּי Chalpai, ut in Talmudistarum scriptis occurrit. Inde (Lucæ xxiv. 18, et Joh. xix. 25), scribitur κλεοπας, quod tamen idem est nomen. Schoettgen. And still more fully Lightfoot. Eundem fuisse Alpheum חַלְפַּי et Cleopham e soni similitudine, tum ex eo quod iisdem Hebraicis literis scribatur, conjectare licet. verum

et liquido constat e (Joh. xix. 24), ubi quæ Maria uxor Cleophæ dicitur, fuit, ut e reliquis Evangelistis constat, Maria uxor Alphæi, mater scilicet Jacobi et Josis, &c. (Matt. xxviii. 56; Mar. xv. 40). And again: Hicce vero Alphæus idem cum Cleopha de quo (Luc. xxiv. 18), haberi debet, Syrum illud כפתי indiscriminatim vel in nomen Hebraicum vel in enunciationem Græcam se format Calphi et Cleophi, prout illud Pauli nomen pro diversa linguarum ratione dupliciter pronunciatum. Hic Cleophas sive Alphæus Mariæ conjux fuit. (Joh. xix. 25). Quæ Maria fuit mater Jacobi minoris et Josis (Mar. xv. 40), nec non Judæ et Simonis. (Mar. vi. 3). Oh fælicem illum Alphæum in trina sua sobole apostolatu insigni! quinimo istum honorem quartus suus filius Joses vix non attigerat." (Acts i. 23).

And Jerome, Mr. Marshall's own witness, adversus Helvidium, writes:—

"Restat conclusio ut Maria ista quæ Jacobi minoris scribitur mater, fuerit uxor Alphæi, et soror, Mariæ matris Domini, quam Mariam Cleophæ Johannes Evangelista cognominat, sive a patre sive a gentilitate familiæ, aut quacunque alia causa ei nomen imponens. Si autem inde tibi alia atque alia videtur, quod alibi (Mar. xv. 40), dicatur Maria Jacobi minoris mater, et hic Maria Cleophæ, disce Scripturæ consuetudine, eundem hominem diversis nominibus nuncupari."

What Jerome hints at here, that Cleopas might be the name of Mary's father, is a solution of the difficulty open to those who are not satisfied in the view of Alphæus and Cleophas being the same person; for Mary is not literally called *the wife* of Cleophas, but Mary of Clopas. And this is the solution which Grotius thinks the most satisfactory—"Inter multas sententias expeditissima est quæ Cleopam ejus patrem, Alphæum maritum statuit." And Dr. Barrett combines both, as in the following table:—

Matthæ.		Jacob.
Cleopas, brother of Joachim, dying without issue, his widow married Joachim, from whom sprang Mary, <i>η του κλωπα</i> .	Joachim, or Eli, married second time to Anna, from whom sprang the Virgin Mary=Joseph.	Alphæus, or Cleopas, married Mary, <i>η του κλωπα</i> , from whom sprang James, Joses, Simon, and Judas.
	 Jesus.	

"Hence James, Joses, Simon, and Judas, are called the brethren of Jesus, because they were related to him, both by the mother's side, and by that of his reputed father." And hence it seems to follow, on every ground, and beyond reasonable question, that the James of whom St. Paul speaks as the Lord's brother, was James the son of Alphæus, James the Less, James

the son of Mary, wife of Cleophas, who was sister of the Virgin Mary; which James presided in the first council at Jerusalem, and was also first bishop of that see, consequently first bishop in the Christian Church.

It does not follow, as a matter of course, that James presided in that council as Bishop of Jerusalem, or because he was a bishop; for apostles being present, their express appointment would be necessary to give authority to preside, and we cannot conceive of such authority being given to any one who was less than an apostle, in the fullest sense of the word; a primary apostle, as Hammond would say—an apostle holding a higher office than that of the episcopacy.

For Hammond's position is totally different from, and irreconcilable with, that of Mr. Marshall; and it is a proof of great carelessness in the latter not to have perceived this. Hammond and his brethren dreaded Rome, and all their weapons were pointed against the Bishop of Rome, as usurping authority over other bishops from sitting in an apostolic chair. It would be to Hammond's purpose if he could show that apostleship and episcopacy were distinct offices, and that episcopacy was respected by the apostles in simple bishops—in bishops who were not originally apostles; and that even Peter, at Jerusalem, was in subjection to the Bishop of Jerusalem, though that bishop should not have been one of the twelve apostles. But Mr. Marshall's argument is, that episcopacy carries with it apostleship, and apostleship in the highest sense; and that St. James, though not one of the twelve, yet, being Bishop of Jerusalem, should be concluded to have received this commission, so undisputed by the twelve, from Christ himself; including, therefore, all that constitutes apostleship, as implied in the quotation from Papias—"James, bishop and apostle;" bishop first, *therefore* apostle; and making him, in fact, universal bishop for the time being, as Bishop of the Hebrew, or only existing Church. For this is evidently Mr. Marshall's meaning, in referring to Brett's comment on St. James's Epistle; though Brett made the remark with another, namely, Hammond's meaning:—

"All which is implied in these passages seems to be confirmed by the inscription of his own Epistle. 'For why does he direct his Epistle to the twelve tribes scattered abroad, but only because he looked upon all those Christians who had been converted from Judaism, yet still thought it their duty to come to Jerusalem to worship, to be under his care, as bishop of that place, to which they yearly resorted from the several countries in which they were dispersed?'" (33).

We believe that no one, from reading the Epistle, would ever imagine that it was written to the Hebrews; and such an idea held either by Brett or Mr. Marshall is in them a suicidal doc-

trine. For grant an universal bishopric, however modified by circumstances—grant the principle only—and the transference of such an universal jurisdiction to Rome is a matter of little difficulty, and would become an inevitable consequence on the destruction of Jerusalem, and Rome becoming the metropolitan Church. Besides, what becomes of the rival Epistle of St. Paul, clearly written to the Hebrews? Is he also an universal bishop? And what becomes of St. Peter, who was undoubtedly the apostle of the circumcision? Is he to be ejected from his office by this claim set up for St. James?

But the whole supposition, from the beginning to the end, is wrong; they confound things which ought to be distinguished—apostleship and episcopacy—and they make distinctions where there are none, or ought to be none, between Jewish and Gentile converts. St. James, who presided in that very council in which it was declared by St. Peter that God had put no difference between Jew and Gentile, in which the purifying their hearts by faith was made the important thing, and in which the yoke of the law was removed from the Christian Church, would not himself be instrumental in frustrating the effect of that relief which he was foremost to give. In the Christian Church the apostles, especially after the decision of that council, could not sanction a distinction between Jew and Gentile, circumcision and uncircumcision—however foolishly some of the people might have clung to the Mosaic law while the temple stood. And even if this folly of the people had been connived at for a time, this partial allowance would not justify any one in using such a temporary concession as an argument for the extent of jurisdiction which it implies becoming an abiding characteristic of Church government, and a permanent feature of the episcopacy of the Christian Church.

Yet when men's minds become unsettled by such writings as these, and that in matters of fact so important as who were the first apostles, and what was the pre-eminence of their office, and how they were distinguished from their successors, it is our duty to endeavour to set these questions at rest; and we maintain that enough is recorded in Scripture to settle these points, if the different parts of Scripture be carefully put together, with the ordinary critical knowledge which such an examination of course requires. And with the doctrine thus ascertained from Scripture we are sure that all genuine tradition and all authentic history will be in accordance, and these last may often contribute greatly towards a clearer elucidation and more complete establishment of scriptural facts.

And we call it the unsettling of men's minds, because the

things brought forward now are novelties—they were not held by the Anglican fathers, though garbled extracts from their writings are brought forward to persuade men that they were. Even Hammond did not hold these doctrines, but was, notwithstanding his mistake concerning St. James, sound in the main principles—that power is from above, and that it was given by Christ to his apostles, and descends *from them* to us; and consequently that bishops are secondary to apostles, and in this sense their successors, succeeding to an administration of that rule and polity which the apostles had set and defined, by plenary authority, received by them immediately from the Lord; but the bishops could have no power to change, or add to, or remodel anything, as they received their commission, not from the Lord in person, but from him through apostles. And it is absolutely necessary to maintain such a pre-eminence as this for the first apostles, who are the foundations of the Church; to establish its surely divine institution, and to defend the faith against all innovation, that we may rest confidently upon the faith once delivered to the saints, as abiding unalterably the same throughout all generations.

But, unfortunately, the difference between apostles and apostles' successors has been lost sight of in modern times; and it is not conceded by the school to which Mr. Marshall belongs that apostleship is thus high and distinct. And it is therefore necessary to show what the Scriptures teach, and what the early Church held, concerning the office of apostle, and the episcopate, and the priesthood; that they are three distinct offices—the apostle having received a commission higher in kind and larger in extent than that of the bishop, as the bishop's commission is higher and larger than that of the simple priest. And the importance of these distinctions will come more and more into manifestation, as men learn more concerning the meaning and specialty of the truths for which they profess to contend, and discern more of the errors with which these truths have become encumbered and obscured—errors which we verily believe to have arisen from one-sidedness, mistaken zeal, and unconscious partiality; not from a predetermination to misrepresent the truth, or a deliberate purpose of saying anything which could not be fully substantiated and borne out by a right understanding of the word of God.

It is strenuously maintained by these parties, that though a priest be empowered by ordination, or rendered capable rather thereby, of discharging all the functions of the priesthood, yet that he needs commission from the bishop to discharge them lawfully. "It is not lawful (says Ignatius) either to baptize, or to cele-

brate the eucharist, without the bishop; but that which he allows is well-pleasing to God." "A priest might administer these sacraments, but not against the will of his bishop, or in opposition or contradiction to him, but by his consent and authority, in a due subordination to him as his superior." (*Bingham*, ii. 3, § 3). And, in like manner, the episcopal office is to be exercised, not according to the will of the individual who holds it—not even according to the will of all the bishops who may have lived in any one age, or in all ages of the Church; but according to the mind of Christ, committed to apostles at the beginning, and by them established as the rule of faith and the foundations of the Church. This the bishops are bound themselves to observe, and enjoin upon their clergy, as much now as in the days of the apostles—as much when there are no apostles in the Church, as they would be if others, like St. Paul, had been continually added to the number.

It is obvious that the nature of the apostolic office can only be determined from Scripture, and that the writings of the fathers can render us but little service in this part of the enquiry. But concerning the name of apostle, which was at first given to bishops as well as apostles, and was afterwards withdrawn from all, save the first apostles, and limited to the apostles of Christ exclusively—concerning this historic fact the writings of the fathers afford us precise information. It is sufficient to quote the words of *Bingham* for this notorious fact, who states (ii. 2, § 1), on the titles of honour given to bishops:—

"The most ancient of these is the title of 'apostles' which, in a large and secondary sense is thought by many to have been the original name for 'bishops,' before the name 'bishop' was appropriated to their order. For at first they suppose the names 'bishop' and 'presbyter' to have been common names for all of the first and second order; during which time the appropriate name for bishops, to distinguish them from mere presbyters, was that of apostles. Thus *Theodoret* says expressly, 'The same persons were anciently called, promiscuously, both bishops and presbyters, whilst those who are now called bishops were called apostles. But shortly after, the name of "apostle" was appropriated to such only as were apostles indeed; and then the name of "bishop" was given to those who before were called apostles.'" "They who are now called bishops were originally called apostles; but the holy apostles being dead, they who were ordained after them to govern the Churches could not arrive to the excellency of those first; nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in many other respects inferior to them. Therefore they thought it not decent to assume to themselves the name of apostles; but, dividing the names, they left to presbyters the name of the presbytery, and they themselves were called bishops." (*Vol. i. 51*).

These "apostles indeed," as Bingham calls them, were distinguished, in many respects, from all others—in themselves, in their office, and in their jurisdiction. In themselves we find a speciality in their calling, their qualification, and their endowments. They were called and named by the Lord Jesus Christ himself—he in his own person calling and naming each one of them personally. This is insisted upon by St. Paul as giving him a right to rank with those who were apostles before him—that he also had seen the Lord; and that he was an apostle, not of man or by man, but of and by the Lord Jesus Christ. Secondly, they were twelve, and twelve only, there being a meaning in the number; so that they are called *the twelve* as distinctly as they are called *the apostles*. The twelve, and the apostles, to whom the Lord appeared after his resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 5, 7), as we learn from the Gospels, were only ten in the first instance, only eleven in the second; yet they are called the twelve, and the apostles—"Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came." (John xx. 24). "Then the eleven went away into Galilee." (Matt. xxviii. 16). Christ having chosen a traitor as one of the twelve, and the filling up his place after the ascension, and before the giving of the Holy Ghost, is another corroboration of apostleship being a twelve-fold unity; Judas, though chosen to be of the number, dropping out of his place for want of unity with the body; Matthias, though not of the original number, being endowed with all its privileges by being united to the body of apostles.

The peculiar qualifications of these "apostles indeed" consisted mainly in their having been ever near the Lord, witnessing all his acts, hearing all his words, partaking his inmost counsels, so as to be the twelvefold embodying of his fulness, and a depositary large enough to contain, and sufficiently diversified to display, the manifold wisdom of God; which no one person ever could contain or reveal, save the God-Man, Jesus Christ, and which it would be blasphemy against the Son of God to ascribe to any one individual except Immanuel. The twelve were ever near him; to them he expounded the parables, which were hidden from other men; to them alone he gave the last supper, and spake to them the largest, most important, and most special of the discourses that are recorded in the Gospels—a discourse directed exclusively towards preparing them for the reception of the Holy Ghost, the other Comforter. And upon the twelve, thus prepared, he breathed after his resurrection, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" that they might know by this earnest of the endowment that he was the bestower, and might be able at once, when the endowment came, to understand it, and refer

it to him, and to use it instantly for building the Church, by baptizing in one day three thousand souls.

All these privileges, peculiar to those who were "apostles indeed," were only preparatory advantages, and all designed to qualify them for that special endowment which the twelve would receive on the day of Pentecost, to enable them to begin that special work of laying the foundations of the Church—a work not for that age alone, but for all generations. And here the whole argument requires that the gift of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost should be limited to the twelve; for they were the chosen witnesses—they only were duly prepared by previous instruction—to them alone the Lord had committed the two sacraments, saying, "This do in remembrance of me"—"All power is given me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, baptizing"—"To the apostles whom he had chosen he showed himself alive after his passion, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; and being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise." (Acts i. 4). And when the promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, "Peter, standing up with the eleven" (ii. 14), announced to the assembled multitude what the promise was, and wherefore it was given, and how in themselves it was then fulfilled.

And this will the more appear, by considering that which was peculiar in the *office* of those who were "apostles indeed." They were chosen, prepared, and commissioned to lay the foundations of the Church; which Church, being one, must have its foundations so broad and so sure, that upon it all mankind, during all generations, may find a footing, the same footing as the twelve, and the hundred and twenty, and the three thousand who were gathered into it on the first day. The office of the twelve was to teach the things which they had been taught, and to commission others with like commission, and to endow others with like endowment, to carry out through all the world, and in all ages, that Gospel which the twelve had received from Jesus Christ. This is implied in the whole of the last discourse to the twelve, and especially in the concluding prayer, where Jesus testified, saying to his heavenly Father concerning the twelve—"As THOU hast sent ME into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.....and the glory which THOU gavest ME, I have given them, that they may be *one*, even as WE are ONE"—them, the first apostles alone; them, as contradistinguished from all others in the Church, who are also prayed

for distinctly and apart, as "them also which shall believe" on Christ through the word of the apostles. (John xvii. 20).

And the endowments of the day of Pentecost are not to be regarded merely as miraculous powers in the general, for such powers the apostles had already received, had received on first being called, and received in common with the seventy disciples (Luke ix. 10-17); but the endowments of the day of Pentecost constituted them "apostles indeed" unto the Church. They were thereby empowered to reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; the Spirit of truth came to guide them into all truth, and to show them things to come; he glorifying Christ, by receiving from the Lord, and showing to the apostles. (John xvi. 14). These endowments of the Holy Ghost, given by Christ unto the Church after he had ascended to heaven, were, to the twelve who had already been called, prepared, and set apart to the apostolic office, their ordination; in these endowments they received those graces needful for the right exercise of their office, which laying on of hands by the bishop at ordination imports towards all who are called to the priestly office. The bestowal of the Holy Ghost upon those who were placed first and highest in the Church must needs be, in this first instance, *immediately* from Christ himself; but in all time following the apostles themselves in their lifetime, and the bishops ever after, stand as ministers of Christ, continuing the grace needful for the right exercise of the priestly office in the Church of Christ.

But as it is clear from Scripture that apostles alone, in the first instances, conferred ordination, and bishops only by authority derived from apostles, so upon the twelve alone must these endowments have been bestowed on the day of Pentecost, that there might be no divided stream of blessing from Christ Jesus, but the whole Church might be under the hand of the apostles, and be kept in unity, by all being under those who had been called, and instructed, and endowed with the Holy Ghost, by Christ himself. In the apostles, therefore, there was inherent capacity and endowment for every office in the Church; they not only preached as evangelists, and ministered as pastors at the beginning, but served tables as deacons, until the more important duties of the apostleship required their whole time; and even then the brethren only look out for the men—it is the apostles that appoint them to their office; "whom we may appoint over this business." (Acts vi. 3-6). And deacons in after times were called the bishop's heart, hands, and eyes. Yet, concerning those offices which are not apostolical, these

would not be the better discharged in being fulfilled by apostles ; priesthood than by simple priests, for example, supposing them to be equally faithful men. Priestly acts are the same, whether performed by apostle or presbyter ; but a presbyter cannot take upon himself to perform apostolical acts.

Yet the authority given to the first apostles had its checks and limitations, in each one of the apostles being under the control of the apostleship considered as one body. And this was necessary for two reasons—first, for the theological reason, that even in the apostleship, as in the whole Church, the gifts of the Holy Ghost must be in distribution amongst men, that none may arrogate to himself the fulness which alone dwells in Christ Jesus, and that none may fancy himself to be independent of his brethren ; and, secondly, for the ecclesiastical reason, that the first apostles were laying the foundation of the one Catholic Church, and needed to bring the colour of all men's minds, as we may say, to a work which was to be universal, and for all generations ; and though, touching the creed, it be a fabrication, some such truth as this is intended in the legend, that each one of the apostles furnished one paragraph of the Apostles' Creed ; all thus making up, by some special contribution from each one, that which was to be the summary of the one Catholic faith.

And this collective, yet universal jurisdiction, in matters of faith which belonged to the apostles as a body, and was carried out by each of them individually, was transmitted, in a more restrained sense, to their successors, the bishops :—

“Hence came that current notion, so frequently to be met with in Cyprian, of but one bishopric, in the Church, wherein every single bishop had his share in such a manner as to have an equal concern in the whole ; ‘*Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.*’ For in St. Jerome's language, they were all ‘*ejusdem meriti, and ejusdem sacerdotii.*’ In things that did not appertain to the faith they were not to meddle with other men's dioceses, but only to mind the business of their own ; but when the faith or welfare of the Church lay at stake, and religion was manifestly invaded, then, by this rule of there being but one episcopacy, every other bishopric was as much their diocese as their own, and no human laws or canons could tie up their hands from performing such acts of their episcopal office in any part of the world as they thought necessary for the preservation of religion.”—*Bingham*, ii. 5, § 2.

We cite this passage merely to show that there are traces, in the succeeding ages of the Church, of that constitution which had belonged to the apostolic body, but not at all conceding that it ought to be considered a part of the episcopal office for each one to become a sort of universal bishop, and denying that

any such occasion ought to arise—denying that any could arise, but by some deplorable necessity, which would supersede all law; and, above all, we do not assent to the free and easy way in which human laws and canons are supposed to tie up the hands of a bishop, as if the framing of canons were not an essential part of the episcopal office. And we hold that human laws and canons, even though they should be oppressive, are to be obeyed in the first instance, until all legitimate efforts have been made to amend what is evil.

St. Paul, from his copious writings, affords us the fullest evidence of the prerogatives and extent of the apostolic office. Though he was the last called, and not, properly speaking, one of the twelve, yet he gives place to none of them in the way of subjection, and takes every opportunity of magnifying his office. St. Paul regarded his own commission as being especially that of apostle to the Gentiles, according to the words twice spoken, both at his first call on the way to Damascus (Acts xxvi. 17), and when he saw the vision in the temple (Acts xxii. 21). I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles. And this view of his calling was allowed, and this special commission to the Gentiles was sanctioned and confirmed, by the other apostles, who, seeing that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto Paul, as the Gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter, gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that they should go to the heathen, as the other apostles to the circumcision. (Gal. ii. 7). Not that there were two Gospels, but that the different condition of Jews and Gentiles required a different mode of preaching the same Gospel; and God, that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in Paul toward the Gentiles. But it throws a somewhat curious light upon that GENTILE Church which calls itself, *par excellence*, APOSTOLIC, that this PAUL should be comparatively *forgotten* by ROME, and PETER should be made *all in all*: Paul, who in every epistle puts forward his apostolic office; Peter, who only calls himself an elder: Paul, who gave place to none, no, not for an hour; Peter, who was withstood to the face, because he was to be blamed, and withstood by the comparatively despised Paul, of the Roman Catholic Church.

Paul was an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father; yet even he thought it right to go up to Jerusalem, not merely to have his commission allowed by the apostles, which were in Christ before him, but also to test the truth of the things which he was preaching to the Gentiles; and lest, there being but one Gospel, he should

have been giving them a partial or imperfect representation of the truth, and so should have been labouring in vain. Nay, it was so needful that he should do so, that God *sent* him there, for he writes—"And I went up *by revelation*, and communicated unto them that Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain." (Galatians ii.) Notwithstanding his divine commission, the possibility of his failure, if standing alone, and the necessity of support from the other apostles, are recognized. And although the others, "in conference, added nothing" to St. Paul, yet it is to be inferred that they *might* have added something, and that no one apostle could be sure of his own catholicity and orthodoxy, unless he is sure that he has the assent and consent of all the other apostles. But *having this*, St. Paul could *then* say—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. i. 8). So confident is he now in the absolute certainty of the truth he preached! Yet he says, "*though we*;" he implies the possibility of his own failure, if left to himself; even he might so change that Gospel as to make it, not *another Gospel*, for there is "*not another*," but a perversion of the Gospel—a message, the bearer of which should be held accursed.

And all this must be held in full confidence that Paul was quite competent to do his own work, and to do it better than any other apostle could do it for him. No other would Paul allow to interfere with his work, and he was careful not to interfere with the work of any other. "Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." (Rom. xv. 20). And, therefore, even in this act of deference to the other apostles, St. Paul shows a full consciousness of his own freedom of action in his own sphere and for his own work, refusing to be brought into bondage to any—saying to the Galatians concerning such false brethren, "to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you." Yet Paul, and Peter, and Barnabas, with the whole Church at Antioch to help them, found questions sometimes would arise which they could not settle, and for the deciding of which it was necessary to appeal to the council of apostles and elders at Jerusalem. (Acts xv.) The decisions of that council Paul himself carried back to Antioch, as the definitive settlement of the question, and proceeded also to visit the Churches throughout all Asia; "and as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem. And so were

the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily." (Acts xvi. 4).

Rothe makes some remarks very much to the purpose on this subject (p. 302):—

"The apostles were for all^{*} Christian Churches the ultimate communicators of their Christian life, and therefore also the ultimate and adequate authority in all religious affairs. They lay under the specific obligation to care and to watch for all Churches, to occupy towards them the place of the Lord himself.....As regarded their proper missionary exertions, they no doubt partitioned among them the great field of labour laid open to them. (2 Cor. xi. 28; Gal. xi. 7; Rom. xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 13).....Yet the apostles were not on that account limited to that narrow and special sphere of labour which each had marked off for himself; but each of them possessed the full title to assert his apostolical dignity throughout the whole of Christendom. And the New Testament shows how they made use of that title. Each apostle had the right and duty to superintend all Churches; or (in legal phrase) the call to the supreme direction of the Christian Churches accrued to the apostles '*in solidum*.' Each possessed authority to guide the whole, yet no one as an individual, but each essentially, only as in communion with all the rest. It was not the apostles, but the college of apostles,* who ruled the whole; and each one exercised his superintending authority, not as his individually, but as that of the college of apostles; and even although it should not be on every occasion by express commission from the apostolic body, still it was by virtue of such general deputation, and with the consciousness of each being accountable to the body for the exercise of the same. And how wholesome was this peculiar relation! According to it, each apostle found in the rest the necessary complement of his acting. Their various determining religious peculiarities mutually completed and modified one another, and balanced each other unto an intimate and yet full-toned harmony; so that, by the living and perfect interchange of all their operations, that condition of the Church might be attained and preserved which Paul calls the perfect man, according to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."....."The institution of the apostolical delegates was only a necessary organ which the college of apostles added to itself for the sake of assisting in the active carrying out of its supreme directions to the whole of the Christian Churches. As soon as the sphere of Christianity became in any considerable degree enlarged, it was found impossible for the apostles to exercise their direction and superintendence immediately and in person over all.....especially for those who, like Peter and Paul, had many Churches to care for. Such apostles could only mediately, or by the help of others, exercise apostolic guidance over all

* This appears also from the immediate filling up of the place of Judas, vacated by his treason and death; which shows that the apostles regarded themselves as directed to a collegiate exercise of the apostleship committed to them by the Lord. *Δει οὖν, &c., must be chosen.*

those Churches which were peculiarly attached to them—and this they did by the instrumentality of tried and judicious men, selected from those with whom they held the closest communion; and these they deputed to act in their names, and clothed with their authority through-out a certain range of Christian Churches. Such men we call, shortly, apostolic delegates. They were not placed in perpetuity, over a fixed territory, greater or less, of Christian Churches, but only for a period; in order that, after they had there met the most pressing exigencies (such as, for example, might occur on the planting and first setting in order new Churches), they might be removed to some other places, where, in the meantime, the exercise of plenary apostolical power had been more required. Many such men are to be read of in the New Testament—many erroneously supposed to have been bishops (as we understand the term), but who exercised a temporary authority, somewhat similar to that of bishops in later ages, but more extensive, and far more extensive than that of presbyter bishops in the primitive Church.....Such were Timothy, Titus, Marcus, Silvanus, Clemens, Epaphras, &c. They had a peculiar calling, to which, in later times, no fit parallel can be found, and were often called by the ancient writers, as Theodoret, apostles, because the representatives of apostles"

The Church of Rome, in a pre-eminent degree, overlooks these facts, in claiming universal jurisdiction for her bishop, as sitting in St. Peter's chair. Peter himself had no such jurisdiction; Paul would not have allowed it in the Churches of Asia; and we see that he had it not in Jerusalem, or that council, from Acts xv. But all the High Church party are in a similar error, though lower in degree, when they rest their claims upon the supposed analogy between apostles and successors of apostles, and would infer, that whatever apostles did at the beginning, the successors of apostles are both entitled and competent at the present time to do. The apostles, and the apostles' delegates, were not bishops; and bishops are not apostles, nor apostles' delegates; though bishops have succeeded to apostles, to carry on the work of apostles, by doing the work of bishops in the several districts or dioceses which they are severally commissioned by Christ—the Universal Bishop—to oversee. The province of the bishop is necessarily local, though his ordination is good everywhere, and both his jurisdiction and his ordination are regarded as perpetual, not temporary. The province of the apostle was universal, his authority supreme everywhere; although from accidental circumstances and for mutual convenience, each apostle was understood to have his own peculiar province. And the province of the apostolical delegate was, first, larger than that of the bishop, in being commensurate with that of the apostle, whom, for the time being, he represented; secondly, not co-extensive in time with that of the bishop, since

it was in its very nature transient, and only *pro hac vice*: as Timothy was sent to Ephesus, and Titus was sent to Crete, to do a certain work, and when this was completed, they were employed on other work. And though they were appointed bishops afterwards, this is not to the point; for when they became bishops they had ceased to be delegates, and were not in the *quasi-apostolic* category. Timothy as the delegate of Paul, and Timothy as Bishop of Ephesus, held two very different offices. And really these are the facts that we must bear in mind, or we shall for ever be at cross purposes, and grow angry with each other, by each supposing the other to be perverse or most unreasonable in his opposition, when all along we may have been speaking of different things under the same names, and so each controverting, not what his antagonist did hold, but what he is supposed to hold.

It is for things alone that we ought to contend, and not for words or names. The things existing in the apostolic age do not now exist; we have not such apostles, and such apostles' delegates, as are to be found in Scripture. And the things now existing did not exist in apostolic times; there were not any bishops in the apostolic age, exercising the functions of apostles, or of apostles' delegates. It remains, therefore, to show by what steps the Church came into its present condition, and, by placing the episcopacy on its true basis, give it more solid and enduring claims upon the respect and attachment of the Church, than it can acquire by the wild pretensions to some stilted exaltation put forward by over-zealous partizans.

During the lifetime of the first apostles—those whom Bingham calls “apostles indeed”—all Catholic truth had been declared, and the foundations of the Church had been laid broad and deep, so as to bear the superstructure which was to be built thereon throughout all succeeding ages: and “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” (1 Cor. iii. 11). Christ is the foundation, but that foundation was laid by apostles and prophets (Eph. xi. 20); and upon it the whole superstructure of the Church is built. Christ himself made all the preparation for this work, in what he spake, and did, and suffered, while on earth; but the work was not begun till his ascension, for in heaven the foundation was laid, and he from heaven gave the Holy Ghost, which was the indispensable preliminary, and the promised qualification to the apostles for that work. The apostles did their work perfectly, and to the utmost of their power; and where, from the multiplicity of Churches, they themselves could not visit all, they employed faithful men, like Timothy, to give a sort of ubiquity to the apostolic over-

sight and apostolic guidance. By these means the one Catholic doctrine and order was preserved in all the Churches during the apostolic age, and all the essential truths of Christianity were declared and established. And the apostles took care of this, not only while they lived, but also with reference to the well-being of the Church after their departure: and this they did, not by leading the Church to expect that other apostles would be called in their room; and still less by telling such men as Timothy that they, in such a case, would become apostles; but by enjoining Timothy and other faithful men to hold fast the truths which they had been taught by the apostles, and to commit those same truths to other faithful men, through whom, and other such men, they might be transmitted to the Church of all succeeding generations. "I will not be negligent (says St. Peter) to put you always in remembrance of these things.....Moreover, I will endeavour that you may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance." And St. Paul, writing to Timothy, says—"Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us. And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."

It is evident that there is here no place for succeeding apostles—no contemplation of a contingency arising which might require the presence of an apostle to bring out new principles, or re-adjust or enlarge the foundations which had been already laid. It was to hold fast that which was given they were called; they could not add to these things—they could not change them but for the worse; and no fancied development could mean anything more than some slight accommodation of the same principles to the novel exigencies of an entirely new state of circumstances—no new foundations, no abolition of any that are old—any that are apostolic, laid by "apostles indeed." Yet since, at the giving of the law, no prophet was contemplated therein, save the prophet like unto Moses, even Jesus Christ; but still prophets were continually sent, when the people had broken the law, to warn them and bring them back: so, under the Christian dispensation, men of apostolic power may have been raised up from time to time, when the Church has departed from the ways of God, and cannot be brought back by ordinary means.

The ordinary means for governing the Church, and keeping men in the apostolic faith and practice in all succeeding times, has been by the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons—

orders which can be clearly traced up to apostolic times, though they ought to be regarded as joining on and succeeding to the first condition of things in the Church, and not as two conditions in anomalous co-existence. For as much as apostles were above bishops in the primitive Church, so much were deacons below what we understand of deacons in the Church at all succeeding times. The deacons of the apostolic age are not to be regarded as belonging to the clergy, or having any higher call than the choice of the people. So that apostles, delegates, and presbyters are the three ecclesiastical orders of the apostolic age, which answer to bishops, priests, and deacons, as existing in the Church in all the following ages. Upon the bishops necessarily devolved all those apostolic functions which the well-being of the Church required, and without which, in fact, it could not continue to exist—functions which had previously been exercised by delegates as well as apostles, but to which no mere presbyter was competent, because the chief of them was the ordaining of presbyters—an act which implies superiority in the one who confers it. The power of ordaining has been, from the time of the departure of the apostles, confined to bishops alone. This is an historic fact which cannot be denied by any one who is well informed on the subject. But this includes examination of the candidates for orders, and especially in matters of faith and doctrine—making the bishops virtually the depositaries of apostolic faith and doctrine; to which, if we add licence or mission, which is always in the hands of the bishops of each diocese, we have, in these matters of fact, all that is necessary to constitute succession to apostolic authority; the bishops have, in fact, all power in faith, in admission to orders, and appointing to the consequent duty.

An unprejudiced person, if such an one there be, and even any one who will examine the writings of both parties, will be surprised to find how very confidently both the Episcopalian and the Presbyterian champions lay claim to the verdict of antiquity. Blondel, Salmasius, and Dail   appeal to the fathers in as triumphant a tone as Dodwell, Hickes, and Hammond, or any other Episcopalians: and those appeals to antiquity of which we are speaking are made in good faith, and with a full persuasion that the facts are as they represent them, whether made by a Blondel or by a Hammond. And both representations of the mere facts are true in the main, but the facts do not come up to the case of either party; and it is in the inferences from those facts that the divergence lies, and becomes, in some cases, so great as to lead to perfectly opposite conclusions.

St. Jerome may be taken as an instance of what we mean,

who really held too low an opinion of the episcopal office, reckoning it to be an office for better governing the Church, rather than an order of divine appointment; yet who does very strongly enjoin obedience to the bishop, as a duty incumbent upon all. And St. Jerome is, on these accounts, appealed to by both these parties, and with equal truth by both parties, but in neither case with full discernment of what Jerome's meaning is, even in the passages to which they refer, much less in his writings generally. In so voluminous a writer as Jerome, and whose writings, therefore, cover so great a lapse of time, it is perhaps scarcely reasonable to expect perfect, undeviating consistency in an uninspired man. Blondel plied so hard single passages from Jerome against the High Church party, that some of the ablest among them at that day were disposed to throw Jerome himself overboard, and class this father with the Presbyterians. Bishop Parker, for instance, writes thus, in his "Era of the Church immediately after the Apostles:"—

"In this St. Jerome himself is as unhappy as any of his pretended followers..... Yet, notwithstanding that, St. Jerome hath thus clearly demonstrated the falsehood and vanity of his own surmise." (p. 144). "And therefore neither St. Jerome, nor the counterfeit Ambrose, nor any other that lived in the fourth century, ought to be regarded or trusted for anything they say concerning things done in the first, when they bring nothing to prove it but their own assertion."—*Tracts of the Anglican Fathers*, vol. iii. p. 154.

Yet so little is Mr. Marshall aware of this, that of St. Jerome he says—

"A few passages only need be quoted from his writings; for, like the rest of our brethren, he has spoken so emphatically, that in a single sentence he often declares all which could be asserted in many volumes." (p. 230). "It is difficult to speak with due calmness of the treatment which St. Jerome has received at the hands of the Church's adversaries (*Qy.* was Bishop Parker one of these?); and I shall not do more here than mention it as an instance of the humiliating tyranny of error..... With what incredulous amazement, we may suppose, would a simple-minded enquirer, ignorant of sectarian bitterness and fraud, hear the statement, that the author of the passages above quoted was a witness against the divine institution of bishops!" (p. 236).

We shall, no doubt, excite some incredulous amazement in the simple-minded writer of the above, by avowing ourselves of Bishop Parker's opinion, that Jerome did not allow of the divine institution of bishops, and that Mr. Marshall has misunderstood the meaning of all the passages which he has quoted. These, which Mr. Marshall thinks are so decisive, are of two classes—

the first, from analogy, between the Jewish and Christian institutions—"Abide in subjection to your bishop, and regard him as the father of your soul."... "What Aaron and his sons were, the same we must acknowledge the bishop and his presbyters to be." The second class, from analogy also drawn, between a king and a bishop—"It is lawful to the people to weep; to the king it is not becoming to do so. As with the king, so with the bishop; or rather, still less to the bishop than to the king, since the one rules over willing, the other unwilling, subjects." (p. 231). Now we profess ourselves utterly unable to perceive, in any such passages as these, the witness of Jerome in favour of the divine institution of bishops. The most that they prove is this—that as for the good government of the Jewish people God appointed Aaron and his sons, and as for the good government of nations kings are appointed; so for the good government of the Church bishops are appointed, and, of course, for the same reason ought to be obeyed. Jerome does not go a jot further than this; he does not say who ought to appoint the bishops—he does not say they are of divine appointment; and, on the contrary, we know, from his other writings, that he held the office of bishop to be of human institution, though, like every other ordinance of man, it was to be obeyed as to the Lord, and for the Lord's sake. We hold him to have been wrong in his doctrine concerning episcopacy, but we believe it to be mere folly or mistake to suppose him an advocate for its divine institution.

And we never can pass by these attempts to deduce Christian institutions from the Mosaic law without expressing our decided contradiction of all such doctrine. If we were left without directions on this subject, our adoption of Mosaic practices would be at best only imitation; but we have express directions to the contrary, and the whole tenor of St. Paul's precept and practice is to the one end of showing that the Christian Church is in a totally different standing from the Jewish, as to priesthood, together with every other ordinance; and as to priesthood especially, because our High Priest, who is of necessity only one, is Christ Jesus in the heavens, and there cannot by any possibility be any one on earth answering in the Christian Church to what Aaron was in the Jewish. And besides these higher grounds, even on the low ground of imitation it is absurd, for it would necessitate there being only one bishop in Christendom, as there was but one high priest under the law—an absurdity which the Romanists may wink at or gulp, but which we see clearly, and cannot swallow.

And even the excellent Bingham, learned as he was, does not seem to be sufficiently aware of the very low notions which

Jerome entertained concerning the episcopal office, when he says of him—

“ St. Jerome, who will be allowed to speak the sense of the ancients, makes no difference in these words—*ordo, gradus, officium* ; but uses them promiscuously, to signify the power and jurisdiction of bishops above presbyters of the whole Church ; which is, properly speaking, the very essence of their order.” (ii. 1).

St. Jerome does not speak the sense of the ancients, for he does not allow this power and jurisdiction to be by divine institution, but by concession of the Church. And St. Jerome does draw a distinction between *gradus, officium, et ordo* in one of the passages referred to by Bingham, if he had quoted the *whole* of the sentence :—

“ *Episcopus, et presbyter, et diaconus, non sunt meritorum nomina, sed officii. Nec dicitur, si quis episcopatum desiderat, bonum desiderat GRADUM, sed bonum OPUS desiderat quod in majori ORDINE constitutus, possit, si velit, occasionem exercendarum habere virtutum.*”

The latter clause, in italics, Bingham has unaccountably omitted ; and it looks the more suspicious as making so strongly against his argument ; but we will not allow ourselves to suspect any intentional unfairness.

It is clear from all Jerome’s writings that he held but two divine grades in the Church—priests and deacons ; and that he regarded bishops as of the priestly grade, but advanced to an office of rule, without any higher ordination ; and that though the ordaining of priests was restricted to the bishop, he did it by virtue of that ordination which he had as a priest, and not in consequence of having himself a higher, that is, an episcopal, ordination or grade.

“ Unde et ad Titum, et ad Timotheum de ordinatione episcopi et diaconi dicitur : de presbyteris omnino reticetur : quia in episcopo et presbyter continetur.” “ Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui cæteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est ; ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi ecclesiam rumperet. Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclum et Dionysium Episcopos, presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant.” “ Diligenter attendamus apostoli verba dicentis.....presbyteros.....episcopum.....Idem est ergo presbyter qui episcopus, et antequam diaboli instinctu, studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, ‘ ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, &c.,’ communi presbyterorum consilio, ecclesiæ gubernabantur. Post quam vero unusquisque eos quos baptizaverat, suos putabat esse non Christi, in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de presbyteris electus supponeret cæteris, ad quem omnis ecclesiæ cura pertineret, et schismatum semina tollerentur. Putat aliquis non scripturarum, sed nostram esse sententiam,

episcopum et presbyterum unum esse, et aliud *tetatis*, et aliud esse nomen officii; relegat apostoli verba Phil I. cum episcopis et diaconis. Et altero testimonio comprobetur Act. xx. presbyteros ecclesiæ..... quo vos spiritus sanctus posuit episcopos..... Hæc propterea, ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse presbyteros quos et episcopos: paulatim vero ut dissensionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem solitudinem esse delatum. Sicut ergo presbyteri sciunt se ex ecclesiæ consuetudine ei qui sibi præpositus fuerit esse subjectos: ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate, presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere." (In Tita, vol. ix., p. 245).

If the Church were like the State, merely a polity, and if the only things required were good government and willing obedience, it would not much signify whether men held the opinion of Jerome, or believed the truth; for men are found to obey as willingly a ruler of their own choosing as one who is appointed of God. But we see far more than rule in the office of a bishop—we recognize in it the means, and the only means after the departure of apostles, for preserving ordinances of any kind in the Church. It is for the spiritual blessings retained in the Church through bishops that we chiefly prize them: it is for the divine life, and grace, and truth which have been thus transmitted to us, that we prize them: it is because the Holy Ghost, given by Christ to the apostles, has been handed down to us through bishops, that we regard them as apostles' successors, and essential to the existence of the Church, in perpetuating the presence of the Holy Ghost. The bishop's most important functions, and those which are peculiar to him, have nothing to do with rule—they are solely for the impartation of grace. There is no act of rule in confirmation, which is exclusively the bishop's act, and is sought to by every child for the grace necessary to fulfil its baptismal vows, and worthily to receive the body and blood of the Lord. There is no act of rule in ordination, but in it the bishop not merely admits into the priestly office, but transmits from Jesus Christ the grace necessary to discharge its solemn duties—rightly to preach the word of life, properly to administer the holy sacraments, and faithfully to watch over the flock of Christ. These are the most solemn responsibilities that can occupy the soul of man—of the bishop towards the Church, and of every member of the Church, whether of the clergy or laity, towards the bishop; and compared with these, the questions of good order, and the things which Jerome speaks of, are trivial indeed; nay, would of necessity follow, and be far better attained, because attained in the right way, when the higher responsibilities were duly appreciated on

both sides. But, alas ! even in Jerome's day faith was on the wane ; and we shall never mend matters, save by our increasing faith. Let the bishops have full faith in their high and holy calling, as ordained by Christ to impart the Holy Spirit to the Church ; and let the Church have faith in them, as appointed over priests and people for that very end ; and God would meet and reward this faith by pouring out a blessing, till there should not be room to receive it.

The true standing of a bishop, as successor of apostles, is succeeding to apostolic grace ; and if men would confine their attention to this, and not waste their patience at cross purposes, by using words of ambiguous signification, the necessity and importance of the episcopal office would become evident to all. The bishop's claim to rule rests on other grounds than apostolic succession ; and with this we are not at present dealing. The apostles were not lords, for the double reason of there being still in subsistence an hierarchy appointed of God, whom Christ had commanded them to obey, as sitting in Moses' seat ; and because both Jews and Christians were at that time in like bondage to the Romans. And as the apostles were not lords, so neither was the kind of supremacy which the apostles had over the whole Church the type or warrant for the more circumscribed and less absolute authority which bishops exercise in their several dioceses. The bishops are entitled to all these things, but on other grounds than apostolic succession.

The true standing of a bishop, as apostles' successor, is an apostolic standing, commensurate in grace and importance with that of apostles, in order to do the same work, and in order to do it as effectually as apostles did it. Not to do all the work that the apostles did, and become quasi-apostles, or secondary apostles—not to do the same work, in all respects, as the apostles did ; but to carry on the same work which apostles had commenced, and in the same way that apostles would have carried it on if they had continued as a standing order in the Church. The plan of the Church was entrusted to apostles by Christ ; they, as wise master-builders, laid the foundation ; on it the bishops of all succeeding time have had to build—following no other plan—laying no other foundation : and exactly thus would apostles have had to carry on the work if they had continued in the Church. And it may be in mercy that apostles ceased, not to expose them to the temptation of innovating, or the Church to the temptation of demanding change ; it may be, in order to enable the Reformers to take the confident stand they did against the innovations of Rome, which none but an apostle could have power to introduce—which no true apostle would

shame his predecessors and falsify the primitive Church by introducing—and which therefore, apostles being absent from the Church, stand out in their true and prominent deformity of both usurpation and falsehood.

Apostolic grace is the inheritance of bishops, as successors of apostles; and this, in all its fulness, to continue the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church—the same grace, the same Holy Spirit which was first brought into the Church by apostles. The whole history of the Church in Scripture shows that this grace was not to be obtained at the beginning, save through apostles, or those commissioned by them; and in after times, only in a legitimate and ordinary way, through bishops, as successors of the apostles. We say legitimate, because we know of no other appointed channel for this apostolic blessing, and not daring to limit God's grace in any way, and not taking upon ourselves to pronounce judgment upon others, or to cut off those who, without fault of their own, may be deprived of the ordinary channels for apostolic grace and blessing. The grace is to faith; faith lays hold of a promise, and there is no promise of the grace we speak of, save to apostles, and those holding of them; to them were the promises specially made, before Christ ascended to the Father. And this specialty lies as much in the thing which was to be done, as in the parties appointed to do it.

For this grace peculiar to the apostles, and by the bishops transmitted to our own time, is not the power of working miracles, which was a power given to the seventy also, and merely an attestation of divine mission, and, as such, had been given to prophets and men of God before the coming of Christ. It was a grace distinct from and greater than any work which had been previously wrought, and even greater than the works which Christ himself had wrought in the days of his flesh. For, speaking to the apostles, Christ says—"Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and *greater works than these* shall he do, because I go unto my Father." Christ was not then glorified—the Holy Ghost had not then been given; but on ascending to his Father, Christ gave the Holy Ghost to the apostles, both to do the same works which he had done, and greater works: greater in the *same kind* than his they could not be, therefore they were of *another kind*—of a *greater kind*; they were works testifying that Christ was *glorified*—works of that other Comforter whom he would send from the Father, and to do works which could not be done till that time, because the glorification of Christ was the preliminary to their being begun; and this glory is the scale to estimate how

far the works which testify of it should be greater than all preceding works—greater than those wrought by Christ in humiliation.

The grace we speak of is all that the presence of the Holy Ghost, the third person of the blessed Trinity, has brought into the Church; and the spirit of man is the region of this divine operation—a higher region than that of sense or intellect, and therefore a greater work than those that address themselves to the sense or to the understanding of man. This work is what St. Paul speaks of as the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory, which had not entered into the heart of man, but God hath revealed to us by his Spirit, and which he calls, in conclusion, the mind of Christ. (1 Cor. ii. 16). To know the mind of Christ the gift of the Holy Ghost was needed, as we see in the great instance of the apostles themselves, and their ignorance of the meaning of the words of Christ before the day of Pentecost, compared with the understanding they had of these things after the Holy Ghost was given on that day. And it is the mind of Christ, not of the Holy Ghost; for the Spirit brings no new revelation—he speaketh not of himself—he receiveth of the things of Christ, and showeth them unto the apostles. (John xvi. 14). And not only unto the apostles was given the Holy Ghost for themselves, that they individually might know the mind of Christ, but unto them he was given that they might impart him to others, and so to the whole Church, that the whole Church might know the mind of Christ: so that by the laying on of apostles' hands men might receive the Holy Ghost. Truly wonderful it is that this should be the case! Truly wonderful that the gift of God should be in the hands of men! A greater work truly is this than healing the sick, or giving sight to the blind, yea, or even raising the dead.

St. Paul, writing to Timothy, says—"That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us"—the same Holy Ghost preserving the same truths "And the things thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." This is tradition; but the tradition thus handed down is not a vague thing—an unknown thing, to come into manifestation we know not how or when; but it was the one truth—the unchangeable Gospel—the mind of Christ; the same which Paul and James, Cephas and John preached, and which they all alike transmitted to us through faithful men—that is, bishops. For St. Paul, writing to Titus concerning the duties of bishops, says—"For a bishop must be blameless, as the

steward of God, not self-willed.....holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." And this faithful word cannot be held fast but by the Holy Ghost; for as at the beginning it was not the word of Christ alone, nor the Holy Ghost alone, that qualified the apostles, but the Holy Ghost taking of the things of Christ and showing it to them, that made them spiritual; so is it in the Church unto the end. To Timothy it was committed in the power of the Holy Ghost, and by the same Spirit it is kept undefiled in him, and together with, and in the power of the same Spirit, it is transmitted to others. And therefore it was by the laying on of hands that the gift was accompanied, that the Spirit might go along with the word—from Paul to Timothy, from Timothy to those whom he might ordain to the end of time.

Bishops are constituted stewards of the truth of God, and guardians of sound doctrine in the priests committed to their charge. The primary duty of bishops was like that of apostles—ministerial from Christ to the Christian priesthood, qualifying them for their work, and superintending them in doing it; and not priestly between God and the people. If this had been kept in view, it would have prevented much confusion of thought in those who, like Jerome, question the distinction between the office of bishop and that of priest; and it would also suggest to them the necessity of such a perpetual provision for retaining apostolic doctrine in the Church, and transmitting the Holy Ghost to make that doctrine, not a mere exercise of the understanding, but to be both spirit and life. It is apostolic doctrine of which bishops, as apostles' successors, are constituted guardians—neither more nor less than the faith once delivered to the saints.

"For (as Hooker remarks) *ορθοτομεν*, to divide aright, doth note in the apostles' writings soundness of doctrine only; and in meaning standeth opposite to *καينوτομεν*, the broaching of new opinions against that which is received. For, questionless, the first things delivered to the Church of Christ were pure and sincere truth; which whosoever did afterwards impugn, could not choose but divide the Church into two moieties, in which division, such as taught what was first believed, held the truer part—the contrary side, in that they were teachers of novelty, erred."

And if the bishops have not been able to take this their true standing, and thus determine what is apostolic doctrine, the fault has been in the Church as much as in them—in the Church not expecting it at their hands, and not upholding them

by faith in their high and holy calling, by that charity which rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.

“There is crept into the minds of men, at this day, a secret pernicious and pestilent conceit, that the greatest perfection of a Christian man doth consist in discovery of other men’s faults, and in wit to discourse of our own profession. When the world most abounded with just, righteous, and perfect men, their chiefest study was the exercise of piety, wherein, for their safest direction, they reverently hearkened to the readings of the law of God—they kept in mind the oracles and aphorisms of wisdom, which tended unto virtuous life; if any scruple of conscience did trouble them, for matter of actions which they took in hand, nothing was attempted before counsel and advice were had, for fear lest rashly they might offend. We are now more confident, not that our knowledge and judgment are riper, but because our desires are another way. Their scope was obedience, ours is skill; their endeavour was reformation of life, our virtue nothing but to hear gladly the reproof of vice; they in the practice of their religion wearied chiefly their knees and hands, we especially our ears and tongues.”—*Hooker*, p. 325.

And, on the other hand, care must be taken that both bishops and priests are walking according to the precepts of the apostles, and that nothing “is practised corruptly, to the detriment and hurt of the Church, against the purpose of those very laws, which, notwithstanding, are pretended in defence and justification thereof;” which would be “no less repugnant to the grounds and principles of common right, than the fraudulent proceedings of tyrants to the principles of just sovereignty.”

“Did anything more aggravate the crime of Jeroboam’s profane apostasy than that he chose to have his clergy the scum and refuse of his whole land? Let no man spare to tell it them—they are not faithful towards God that burden wilfully his Church with such swarms of unworthy creatures. I will not say of all degrees of the ministry that which St. Chrysostom doth of the highest—he that will undertake so weighty a charge had need to be a man of great understanding, rarely assisted with divine grace; for integrity of manuers, purity of life, and for all other virtues, to have in him more than a man. But surely this I will say, with Chrysostom—we need not doubt whether God be highly displeased with us, or what the cause of his anger is, if things of so great fear and holiness, as are the least and lowest duties of his service, be thrown wilfully on them whose, not only mean, but bad and scandalous quality doth defile whatsoever they handle.” (p. 324).

“There are four things to be considered in a minister of God. 1. Ordination, giving him power to handle sacred things at all. 2. The charge or portion of the Church allotted to him for the exercise of his office. 3. The performance of his duty, according to the exigence of his charge. 4. The maintenance which in that respect he receiveth

We have seen that ordination is unto one of three orders or degrees.

1. Bishops, coming in the room of the first apostles. 2. Presbyters, including therein evangelists. 3. Deacons, not exercising any priestly functions. Concerning the charge committed unto them, according to their degrees:—The bishops had the charge of general oversight and rule over all presbyters, deacons, and people, both as to matters of doctrine and conduct. The presbyters had the general charge of teaching, not of necessity limited to one congregation, yet in subordination to the bishop for doctrine and conduct. The deacons' charge was under the presbyters, and therefore within the limits of a particular Church, and further limited in only having to do with conduct, or such elementary teaching and such priestly acts as the laity might be occasionally entrusted with, though unordained thereto.....For the avoiding of confusions incident unto the cause and question referred to, there is not anything more material than to separate exactly the nature of the ministry from the use and exercise thereof. Secondly, to know that the only true and proper act of ordination is to invest men with that power which doth make them ministers, by consecrating their persons to God, and his service in holy things, during the term of life, whether they exercise that power or no. Thirdly, that to give them a title or charge where to use their ministry concerneth not the *making*, but the *placing* of God's ministers, and therefore the laws which concern only their election or admission unto place of charge are not applicable to infringe any way their ordination." (p. 316).

Ordination, therefore, being for life, a priest who afterwards becomes a bishop does not cease to be a priest; and when he acts as a priest, does so in virtue of his priestly, and not of his episcopal ordination. And in all priestly acts we must account them the same, by whatever priest they may be performed: for the transaction is between God and the human soul; the priest is only the appointed medium, and the more he can be kept as an ordinance only, and not be looked to as a man, the more full and simple will our faith in God become, and the greater will be our blessing.

Men have become afraid of the very name of priest and sacrifice in the Christian Church, in consequence of the mistakes which have been made concerning both by the Church of Rome. But it does not therefore follow that because these things have been abused by them there is no true use of them for us; the first thing is to discover the mistake, and it may then appear that the abuse has arisen entirely from mistake, and that this being rectified, the legitimate use of the things may become evident to all. The word "priest" has many significations, for each of which, in ancient times, there was a distinct word; we, having but one word to express all these different meanings, must be careful that we are keeping to one meaning in the use of the word "priest," whether we are approving it, or protesting against it, in

the Christian Church. Ambiguity is convenient to the Romanists, but it becomes the Protestant to be open and explicit on all occasions. There is a general sense of the word "priest," as one having to do with sacred things and separated to the service of God, not necessarily implying that he offered sacrifices, and this general meaning is conveyed by the word *ιερευς*, from *ιερος*, sacer; and this is the word most frequently used in the New Testament, especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is applied in this sense to the whole tribe of Levi, who are called the Levitical priesthood (Heb. vii. 11), though they only prepared the sacrifices, as Levites, which were offered by the sons of Aaron; and though none of the Levites, except the sons of Aaron, entered into the holy place, or approached to the altar of incense, at any time. In this general sense, the deacons of the Christian Church may be regarded as of the priesthood, being separated to the service of God, and having to do with sacred things, though not yet admitted to the higher offices of the priesthood, which were typified under the law by the acts not allowed to Levites, but reserved to the sons of Aaron. The washings and purifications, both of the persons who were coming to worship, and of the offerings which they brought, were all done by the Levites, and typified the diaconal acts of the Christian Church, in preparing for baptism and the table of the Lord, and also seeing that those who have come under such sacramental obligations are walking consistently towards all men in purity and integrity of life. The priests, answering to the sons of Aaron, present continually at the throne of grace those who are thus prepared to come into the presence of God; and all the sacrifices prescribed for the consecration of the sons of Aaron, and the continual holiness enjoined upon them, and their sustenance entirely from the altar, are designed to be so many admonitions to the Christian priesthood of the solemn responsibility, which lies on them of being examples and guides to the people. And there was one day in the year, the day of atonement, from all the services of which the sons of Aaron were prohibited—it, and all its services, being reserved exclusively for Aaron, or for him who should succeed to Aaron as high priest. On that day the high priest did all the services, those of the priests and Levites, as well as those peculiarly his own; and on that day alone he entered the most holy place, to sprinkle the blood and burn the incense before the mercy-seat of Him who dwelleth between the cherubim. This is the day, and these are the services, which St. Paul has made the groundwork of his argument in the Epistle to the

Hebrews, and from whence he has deduced, not only that Christ is the High Priest of the Christian Church, and that we have no priest on earth; not only that Christ is the one sacrifice for sin, and that there is no other; not only that the one true altar of the Christian Church is in heaven, where our High Priest now mediates for us; but that the services of the Christian Church are a *continuance* of the day of atonement; and that as on that day the high priest did everything, and all other services were suspended, so, in the Christian Church, Christ is the doer of everything, and his ministers are not feeling aright unless they feel that they are but instruments in his hands, and lose altogether the vain confidence of having an independent standing. One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. Our day of grace is our day of atonement—an expansion of that type, so as to cover, absorb, or displace every other type, in a practical sense—while Christ is within the veil, and until he shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation. (Heb. ix. 8, 24, 28).

Christ is the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world; he is also the High Priest who continually presents his own blood before the throne of heaven; and he who once died for our sins now ever liveth to make intercession for us. And as the acts are thus expanded to cover all time, and the acts were begun by him on earth, but are carried out and completed in heaven, so all our days are but as one day of atonement—begun on the cross, running on through all time, until the day of the Lord come and the kingdom of heaven be revealed; and all our services are incomplete to sense, and only what they should be according as faith completes them, by beholding the High Priest and Head of the Church in heaven.

Chrysostom has a true sense of the importance of the priestly office, and of the self-examination which should precede and accompany ordination, in all who undertake so great and so sacred a responsibility. And to dissipate the fears and apprehensions which such an examination might raise, we need only to remember that we are not left to ourselves, and that we are in such sort instruments in the hand of another, that Christ imparts his own strength in the very act of using us: and that distrust of ourselves should ever become the provocative of faith in him. We may well ask, "Who is sufficient for these things?" but must remember that he hath said, "My grace shall be sufficient for thee." We feel persuaded that men in general do not enough consider the responsibilities of the priesthood, as ministers of Christ towards God and towards the people. And it is among

men in general that the tone of thinking most needs raising; for if not, it will but give to the priesthood an air of arrogance, which, not being understood, will disgust and repel; and the want of it among the people deters modest and humble men from following out their own convictions, and from taking upon themselves even that degree of confidence towards God and authority towards men, to which they may, in their secret convictions, believe themselves entitled. Mr. Marsh, who has translated "*Chrysostom*," must, we conceive, have some fear of this kind, which makes him shrink from the place which belongs to him as a priest, and take only that of a presbyter or elder; and think that *Chrysostom* gives "indication of a prevailing disposition in that age unduly to magnify the ministerial office, by borrowing the terms, and investing it with all the peculiarities, of the Levitical priesthood." (Pref. vi.) It is unfortunate for Mr. Marsh's argument that the use of the word complained of did not come in with *Chrysostom*; it is the word constantly used for the Christian priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews; and it is used also by St. Peter in reference to the Church (1 Peter ii. 5, 9); and the word "presbyter" would scarcely be good sense in *Chrysostom's* treatise, as it certainly would not in St. Paul or St. Peter. So also Mr. Marsh's objections to the words "sacrifice" and "altar" proceed from a similar shrinking back from the truth, because the words have been mistaken or misapplied by the Romanists, and by some injudicious persons amongst ourselves. Like as for applying "priesthood" to the Christian ministry, so have we scriptural authority for applying the words "altar" and "sacrifice" to the Christian realities which those things typified. (Heb. xiii. 10-15, 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5). While the old Levitical priesthood subsisted, and there were real altars and literal sacrifices, these all were of no avail, and had no signification, except as they typified Christ about to come; and being come, himself is the grand reality to be apprehended in all Christian ordinances and in every part of our service. Yet, as God, who knew man's limitation and Christ's fulness, appointed many types to prefigure the one Messiah, so there may be similar reasons for various means of apprehending that fulness now, through various Christian ordinances. While Christ is truly acknowledged and duly honoured, we may bear with each other's wants and infirmities, remembering that at present we only know in part, and prophecy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

And it must ever be borne in mind that the Church is one

predetermined in the counsel of God, and for the preparing and perfecting of which he provided all the instruments—Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles. There is substantial unity of action in all the instruments, though they may seem very different instruments, and may appear at different times to be employed on very different kinds of work. The Church is called a building, in order to show this; for though one building of lively stones, each is set in a place of its own, for which it has been adapted. Each builder of the Church has to know this—to know the plan first, and then the means of adapting the various individuals to that one plan. Men have not all the same natural endowments to begin with, nor have they been all found in the same lands, or with the same national or local advantages; and the differences of station and accidental circumstances, as well as of individual character, render some difference of treatment necessary, wheresoever and whensoever a Church is to be gathered and built.

We may borrow an illustration from the builder's art, in the broad and deep foundations laid underground and out of sight; and yet even here different workmen are used to dig the ground, and hew the stones, and cement them. And as the church rises more and more, and the ornamental parts appear, a greater diversity of workmen and of tools are brought more and more into requisition—the roof, and towers, and pinnacles being more complicated than all the rest of the building. And yet it is one church, and one plan pervades the whole, and it all rests on one solid foundation, prepared with exact reference to the predetermined superstructure. And not one of the classes of workmen can be spared, nor can one do the other's work. The stone had to be dug from the quarry; the timber to be felled in the forest; the bricks and the lime to pass through the furnace. And there is the mason, with his pick, to shape the granite; and the carpenter, with his adze and his plane, to fashion the timber; and the pick of the former would as little do for the carpenter's work, as the mason could smooth his granite with the axe and the plane.

And thus it has been in the Church: apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers have all been required—for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. And when the last stones have been gathered by the great Master Builder, he shall bring forth the headstone thereof with shoutings, crying—
“Grace, grace unto it!”

ART. II.—*Rapport Complet de M. Thiers, sur la loi de l'Instruction Secondaire.* Edition populaire. Paris. 1844.

2. *L'Etat, l'Eglise et l'Enseignement.* Par M. A. DE LAMARTINE, Député de Mâcon. Paris. 1843.

3. *Réponse à M. De Lamartine à l'occasion de son écrit l'Etat, l'Eglise et l'Enseignement.* Par CHAPUYS MONTLAVILLE, Député. Paris. 1844.

THE ablest writers on political economy and moral science have ever attached a primary importance to the subject of popular education, though they have greatly differed as to its nature, and the extent to which it should be carried. Some, asserting that the well-being of society is entirely dependent upon its right communication, have nevertheless contended for an education of which religious instruction should not form a compulsory element; others, agreeing to the proposition, have insisted upon this instruction as a proper and necessary part of it; others, again, would confine all education for the lower classes to a simple instruction in religious truths; whilst some few have argued that any education of the poor is prejudicial to the best interests of society. Many, who differ much in other respects, are, however, agreed in the conclusion, that to the extent to which education has been popularly carried, it has hitherto proved a bane, rather than a blessing.

To a certain extent, much of the reasoning which has been employed in the discussion of this subject is now useless, for it has no place. Whether it is good for the people to be educated, or not, has ceased to be a problematical question, as applied to a people altogether ignorant; for nationally, at least in this country, such a people no longer exists. An onward movement of the public mind has taken place; retrogression is neither consistent with the law of our being, nor practicable from the nature of the circumstances in which we find ourselves—a return to ignorance is not possible. The advocates for a national education have adopted such measures as, being once adopted, can never be recalled; and the question now really is, not, shall there be a national education? but what shall be its nature, what its limits, and who shall be its superintendents? The experiment, to a certain extent, has been tried, and some of the results are before us; and, however these results may fortify any man in the opinion that a popular education is neither good nor necessary, they can only now be wisely and rightly employed in the future modification and application of the various systems which obtain, and in the regulation of that onward movement of

the human mind whose progress to the final development appointed for it is inevitable.

One of the remarks which has been made will probably be disputed at the outset. It will perhaps be asserted that the people of this country are still in a condition of great ignorance; and this assertion will be supported by a reference to the various statistical returns connected with the subject; that, in short, as regards them, the experiment of a national education has yet to be tried. To a certain extent, we readily admit this. The amount of ignorance which yet exists amongst the lower classes is very great, and much to be deplored, yet it is not so great as to constitute a national condition—it is the exception, and not the rule. In every town and village throughout the country some provision has been made to meet the exigency. The Church has especially aroused herself to this work, and the best energies of many of her servants have been exclusively devoted to the instruction of the poor; whilst the various Dissenting bodies have established schools in connection with their chapels, and have undoubtedly endeavoured to impart a certain amount of knowledge to the children of their followers. To say that there have been no corresponding effects, would be opposed both to the probabilities of the case and to the *fact*; for, however it may be true that the agricultural poor are yet in much ignorance, it is equally true that the amount of ignorance is not so great as it was, and that in the manufacturing districts, with the exception perhaps of the colliers and miners, there are very few who have not had the means of instruction within their reach, and have not availed themselves of them.

But it is necessary to understand what are meant by the terms “education” and “ignorance;” for with many who reason upon this subject they have very different significations. The meaning which we attach to these words will appear in the course of these remarks. It is our intention not to enter into all the definitions which exist, but to confine ourselves to the one which finds most favour with the philosophic Liberals of the day. Some of the advocates of a national education argue from principles of pure political expediency; they take account only of the mind, and not of the spirit—they deal with men in the mass as so much machinery; one system is to be employed with all; the same amount of information administered, without the slightest provision for, and calculation of, the various differences of mental power and capacity which exist in the constitutions of men, or with the firm assurance, that if such differences do exist they are not owing to anything inherent in man himself, but to the want of aptitude and skill in the system to which he has been

subjected, and the teacher under whom he has been placed. By "education," they understand such an amount of information as shall render men generally intelligent; one sure result of which they presume will be, an enlightened understanding of the several relations which bind society together, and a consequent right estimation of the duties, both social and political, which devolve upon every man in his place. By "ignorance," they understand the want of this knowledge, the absence of which must of necessity be manifested in the continual transgression of the laws which society has imposed upon itself for its well-being, both social and politic. In the systems which they contemplate, religious instruction is considered not to be necessary. Even if it be permitted as an auxiliary, it is by no means to be required as an integral part, because, whatever may be its influence on individuals, it is held that the tendency of its doctrines is to render men egotistical, and that its spirit is of too selfish a character to adapt itself to the many wants and conflicting interests of society at large. Some, who thus define "education" and "ignorance," have, in common with all thinking persons of the present day, a perception of the broken and disorganized condition of ranks, classes, and institutions amongst men, and seek earnestly for a system sufficiently catholic to embrace all within its sphere—sufficiently efficacious to reconstitute the broken elements of society into a state of peace and well-being. The education which they propose will, they think, effect this; and they exclude religious instruction, because in it they can only see, whilst admitting it to have an individual influence, a germ which is sure to be evolved in multiform varieties of fresh division. We need scarcely say, that although we deplore the condition of things as *they are*, and acknowledge that, as religious instruction *is* administered, divisions must continue, we are entirely opposed to any system of education from which it must be excluded; and deny the assertion, that religion—and by that we mean the Christian religion—is not sufficiently large and catholic, in its purpose, spirit, and tendency, to embrace every possible condition and necessity of mankind, or that division is the proper consequence of a right understanding of its principles and precepts.

By those who understand the word "ignorance" as we have explained it, and who assume that ignorance and crime go together, reference is often made to the criminal returns, to prove the great amount of one by the prevalence of the other. This test seems to us, in many respects, inconclusive. The fact itself is disputed; it is said that these returns do *not* bear out the conclusions that are drawn from them; that crime has *not* decreased in the same ratio in which education has been ex-

tended. There are, moreover, causes totally distinct from the existence of ignorance in the criminal, to which, unhappily, most of the crimes which are now committed may be traced; and it is a fact too little considered, that whilst many criminals are altogether ignorant, many also are not,* and that the most revolting of the capital crimes which have of late disgraced the annals of civilization, both in this and the sister country, have been committed by individuals of more than ordinary acquirements and some standing in society. Crime is not the result of an ignorance of the law of man, but of the law of God. There are few, who are unacquainted with the laws of the land in which they live, who do not know, for instance, that murder and theft—offences against the person or property—are transgressions of the law, and as such are punishable. It is not from ignorance in this respect; it is not from the restrictive fear of the penalties which society imposes that crimes are commonly committed.

With one large class of criminals the hope of escape is greater than the fear of detection; and with another there are incentives to crime of too powerful a nature to be opposed by the weak barriers of educational restraint, or even the terrors of a violated and avenging law. The philosophic systems of education which are proposed will meet neither case. In the one, they take it for granted that crime results from an ignorance of human laws, which is not the fact; and having excluded religious instruction, they have no provision to meet that ignorance of the law of God which really does exist, and which is, with the greater portion of criminals, the cause of transgression. In the other, something is wanted which shall take away or weaken the incentives to crime—something which shall give

* In proof of these observations, we would refer to the criminal tables lately laid before Parliament. These returns contain also a table of the ratio in which crime has increased or decreased for the last eight years. They record for the seven years previous to 1843 (we quote from the prefatory remarks) "an almost uninterrupted increase of commitments, and an aggregate increase of above fifty per cent." There was in the year 1843, as compared with 1842, a decrease, but this was "in offences against property committed without violence;" whilst "in the offences against the person there was an increase of fourteen to one per cent. on the whole class, every one of the most atrocious offences showing a considerable increase." The degrees of instruction of the criminals are also calculated in the same tables for the same period. "They exhibit great uniformity, and prove the gradual spread of instruction amongst the lowest class of the community, by the steady decrease in the proportion of criminals unable to read or write;" but it must be remembered, that whilst they prove a great decrease in the amount of uneducated criminals, they prove a great increase on the whole sum of criminals, and therefore of criminals who have received some education. The proportion last year of those who could read and write imperfectly, to those utterly ignorant, was as fourteen to nine; that of criminals possessing a superior education was about one in nine.

bread to the hungry, work to him who is willing to work, and a fair return to the workman for his labour—something which shall ameliorate the condition of destitution, which drives so large a portion of our suffering countrymen into the prisoner's dock and felon's cell. The systems of education which the political economists of the present day too commonly put forward as the *panacea* of all moral evil are, in this respect, it is almost needless to say, utterly inefficacious and powerless. Like most of the systems emanating from a body of men, who, in the exposition of their truly unphilosophical and ephemeral theories, or the gratification of their selfish views, have led the labouring classes of this land from one degree of political delusion and actual misery to another, till the cup of their suffering is well nigh full, they suppose a power of comprehension and a placidity of reflection on the part of the poor which can only exist in situations of comfort and contentment—they provide for an amount of intellectual capacity which does not exist—they display an ignorance of the actual condition of the lower orders—they never contemplate the varieties of disposition and character, the deep things hidden in the hearts and spirits of the meanest, which will continually arise to stultify the plans of him who, having no higher opinion of man than that he is a machine, attempts to deal with him as such. These systems, however fair they may seem in the vision of the dreamer, become, in the present day, a bitter mockery, when applied to the reality—the reality of starving men, with those whom they love, failing day by day for want of necessary sustenance, asking for work that they may honestly maintain themselves and their families, and, unable to procure it, submitted, in this condition, to the operation or judgment of theories concocted amidst the comfortable appliances of some well-appointed library, which either take no account whatever of their misery, or suppose it a trifling evil, which ought to be fully met and compensated by the amount of intellectual entertainment which it is proposed to provide. The utmost that can be done by any educational system, in the extremity of the present times, is to give the suffering poor some principles which shall be sufficiently powerful to enable them, when a condition of privation is inevitable, to bear that privation with as much patience as is possible. Religious instruction will do this, and nothing else—a right knowledge of God and his law—the implantation of the faith, which shall, in the experience of his mercy and goodness, minister comfort and strength in situations where earthly comfort has no voice and fleshly strength no power. We know that mere instruction will not give faith—that this must be of God's grace; but we know

also that religious instruction is, with his blessing, a means to faith, and that the one cannot be looked for in the systems of education which exclude the other. Such systems, where they have been partially tried, have failed—they will fail again and again, to whatever extent they are carried; as all plans for the moral welfare of man have failed, and must fail, which do not take into their calculation the *spirit* of man, and provide for its many wondrous developments and pressing exigencies. It will be answered, that any dealing with the spirit of man passes the province of the political economist and the statesman. This we are aware of, but it is part of the science of statesmanship to know what *is not*, as well as what *is*, within the power of the statesman; and if he cannot of himself accomplish, by the secular machinery of which he moves the springs, the right direction of men's spirits, it is his duty to use the aid of those whom God has set and appointed for that purpose. He has the means of coercion and restraint; he has the law at his command; he can, to a certain extent, preserve order in society; he can prevent, in ordinary times, the aggressive attacks of licentiousness and misrule: but when he endeavours, by any system purely philosophical or political, to instil principles into the minds of the masses which shall be sufficiently powerful to regulate their moral conduct, he passes, utterly passes, the bounds of his office, and attempts a work for which God has given him no authority, no capacity, no strength whatever. To the Church, and the Church alone, belongs the province of the spiritual; and if the statesman would educate the poor, forasmuch as there is no true education of man without the right informing regulation of his spirit as well as of his mind, he must, when he has provided all that belongs to his office to furnish, associate the ministers of the Church with himself in the work, and leave to them the instruction of the people in that fear of God which truly is the beginning of all wisdom, and without which knowledge, no matter what may be its extent, is a curse to its possessor and a bane to all around him.

It is very remarkable how utterly that which is spiritual in the constitution of man seems to be overlooked or forgotten. Almost all the political theorists of the present day pass it by as a thing of nought, existing only in the conceptions of priestly dreamers, or as forming merely a legitimate subject for a curious investigation into the nature of superstition—a subject of intellectual speculation, having no result in action which can be important to society. It is the last thing which they who would treat of man as he is, or who have to deal with the masses of mankind, think it necessary to consider; and yet there

is nothing connected with his being which requires such serious attention and deep reflection.

By many the mind is regarded as the highest part of the human constitution; they hold that there is nothing beyond the region of the intellectual to be reached or affected that can influence the well-being of society; and even if they admit that there is such a thing in man as the spiritual, they transfer the consideration of it to the priest, not as pertaining to a subject wherein he only has authority to decide, but as belonging to the category of the visionary and doubtful dogmas which he is at liberty to teach or to believe, so long as they are not hurtful to the State. It is a subject which statesmen, with few exceptions, have considered beneath their notice: hence political speculations and systems have failed over and over again—hence men who looked for one result have found another—hence the philosophical theories of those who, seeing society in a condition of evil, have desired and attempted to regenerate it, have produced, when put into practice, monstrous combinations of sentiment and crime, false philanthropy and bloodshed, the boast that a pure condition of fraternal association has been attained, co-existent with a system of organized murder in its most revolting forms. Such a result as this was the French revolution, at once a fearful lesson to those who entirely forget that there is such a thing as the spirit in man, or who, in lashing it into energetic action, never give a thought to the terrible nature of those capacities which they are awakening. The Church had forgotten her duty: inoculated with that terrible virus of dissipation and infidelity which polluted the whole moral being of the country, she had either neglected altogether the spiritual powers which she possessed, or abused them for the worst purposes of selfish aggrandisement and State dishonesty. The court considered the people as beings of another and a lower world, the only end of whose existence was to furnish the means by which its own base pleasures and pursuits could be maintained. The statesman was oftentimes the venal servant of the court and the scourge of the nation; whilst the few who saw the growing evil either made it the subject of bitter sarcasms, which at once amused and wounded every class, but benefitted none, or sat down in their court dresses, and all the complacency of elegant cultivation, to concoct philosophical theories which it was impossible ever to realize because of their sceptical falsity, and propound them in holiday phrases to a literary *coterie*, who could give no sound judgment concerning them, because they themselves were too deeply tainted with the moral plague to ascertain its nature, its results, or its remedy.

And all this while the deep ulcers that were festering in the spirits of men were unheeded or undreamed of. The very measures that were taken to cure them, when they first broke forth to view, were the measures of ignorance—the remedy increased the disease. The Church became the victim of the demon which she should have exorcised—the Court, the slave of the ferocious power which it had goaded by oppression into resistance; and the philosopher learned too late the bloodthirsty nature of that spirit which he had evoked, but could not lay. Many noble deeds were done, many noble hearts were broken, in the struggle to avert the final crisis. The chivalry of an old nobility, roused into action, broke through the effeminate restraints of a frivolous fashion; the clergy, startled into repentance, professed their faith, and braved the penalty with dignified and holy meekness; and the philosopher became manly in his eloquent denunciations of the crimes that were committed around him. It was all too late. The *spiritual* in man had been forgotten by every one whose duty it was to remember its existence and guide its developments; and that which was bestowed by God to be the region of high and holy things—the capacity for receiving and giving blessing—became, through neglect, oppression and abuse, the domain of Satan, and the means by which he multiplied cursing and misery amongst men. Nothing was left to those who had so mistaken themselves and their fellows, but to suffer nobly and with resignation; and if they could not ward off the evil, bear its infliction in a manner to win the sympathy of the good, and leave an instructive lesson to posterity. This they did. When the monarchy fell, it was with graceful dignity; and when the Church became, to all outward appearance, extinct, with a martyr's blood she atoned for past neglect, and with a martyr's prayer, in her last hour, commended herself and her persecutors to God for mercy and forgiveness.

This direful event has left results, the influence of which is increasing yearly, and which will be felt to the latest moment of time. It has engendered principles of evil which before had no definite existence; it has gathered into a system, and given a concentrated energy to the floating theories of political fanaticism, of equality and fraternity, which from time to time have broken forth into action only to be coerced—shaking thrones to their centres, and writing their principles in letters of blood during the struggle. It has brought a spirit into life which no power can lay, whose walk is through the length and breadth of Christendom; whose presence is felt in every class of society, and with whom, ere long, all constituted authority will have to struggle for the mastery, and monarchy for an existence. At

this present moment France is rife with the offspring of the revolution. Its idealists and communists, the disciples of St. Simon and Fourier, of Lamennais and the Abbé Chatel, though differing from each other in minor details, have yet one common bond of reunion in the dogma of a fraternal condition of society, which must be struggled for, fought for, and suffered for, till it be attained. This dogma is the more dangerous, because it takes a truth of Scripture for its basis, and, professing to possess the only right interpretation of that truth, gives as its exposition a system replete with infidelity and impurity, as impracticable as it is unsound. It, however, owns disciples in almost every rank, and, though to the plain-thinking Englishman it may seem incredible, has engaged in its propagation, in one form or another, some of the highest intelligences in France. Almost all the romance writers, a large and influential class with the active spirits of the masses, and who unquestionably have great talent, put it forward in one form or another, and make their stories subservient in its recommendation. The authoress who writes under the name of *George Sand* has, for example, many passages in her romances which, whilst they contain some truth, clothe it with such forms of blasphemy as render it in the application a lie, and a lie of a most fearful character. There are two which occur to us on the instant, although, we beg to observe, as regards the first, there is no truth whatever contained that we can discover. They are pertinent to the subject, and we offer them in proof of what has been observed. We have thought well upon the propriety of doing this, for they contain sentiments exceedingly repulsive to a pious mind; but as it is presumed these pages are chiefly read by those whose duty it is to know all the danger with which right and Christian principle is threatened in the present day, and as we wish that the remarks which we make should be borne out by facts, we trust that their insertion here will not be considered as a proof that we have no proper perception of their truly blasphemous character. In part of a novel called "*Consuelo*," of some length, and very carefully written by the above-named authoress, there is a description of a most improbable scene between the heroine and her lover, a Bohemian nobleman—half madman, half *clair voyant*. This scene is laid in a cavern under ground, to which this nobleman was in the habit of resorting for periods of time, in the paroxysms of his disease, and whither the lady who had discovered his secret had followed him, through dangers unheard of, in order to win him back to his afflicted family. She becomes a convert to his views, especially those regarding the existence and character of Satan, for

his madness has a great method of philosophy, scepticism, and republicanism, and with him proceeds from one rhapsody to another, till he, seized with a fit of inspiration, puts his thoughts into music, divinely extemporized on the violin, and she, with a kindred wit, interprets them thus:—

“Tout à coup il sembla à Consuelo que le violon d'Albert parlait, et qu'il disait par la bouche de Satan : ‘Non le Christ mon frère ne vous a pas aimés plus que je ne vous aime. Il est temps que vous me connaissiez, et qu'en lieu de m'appeler l'ennemi du genre humain vous retrouviez en moi l'ami qui vous a soutenu dans la lutte. Je ne suis pas le Demon ; je suis L'Archange de la révolte légitime et le patron de grandes luttes. Comme le Christ je suis le Dieu du pauvre, du faible et de l'opprimé. Quand il vous promettait le règne de Dieu sur la terre, quand il vous annonçait son retour parmi vous, il voulait dire qu'après avoir la persécution, vous seriez récompensés, en conquérant avec lui et avec moi la liberté et le bonheur. C'est ensemble que nous devons revenir, et c'est ensemble que nous revenons *tellement unis l'un à l'autre que nous ne faisons plus qu'un*. C'est lui le divin principe le Dieu de l'esprit, qui est descendu dans les ténèbres où l'ignorance m'avait jeté et où je subissais, dans les flammes du désir et de l'indignation, les mêmes tourments, que lui ont fait endurer sur sa croix les scribes et les pharisiens de tous les temps ; me voici pour jamais avec vos enfans : car il a rompu mes chaînes ; il a éteint mon bûcher, il m'a reconcilié avec Dieu et avec vous. Et désormais la ruse et la peur ne seront plus la loi et la partage du faible, mais la fierté et la volonté. C'est lui, Jésus qui est le miséricordieux, le doux, le tendre et le juste : moi je suis le juste aussi ; mais je suis le fort, le belliqueux, le sévère, et le persévérant. O peuple, ne reconnais-tu pas celui qui t'a parlé dans le secret de ton cœur, depuis que tu existes, et qui, dans toutes tes détresses t'a soulagé en te disant : Cherche le bonheur, n'y renonce pas ! Le bonheur t'est dû, exige le, et tu l'auras ! Ne vois tu pas sur mon front toutes tes souffrances et sur mes membres meurtris la cicatrice des fers que tu as porté ? Bois le Calice que je t'apporte : tu y trouveras mêlés à celles du Christ et aux tiennes ; tu les sentiras aussi brûlantes et tu les boiras aussi salutaraires.’”

Consuelo (such is the name of the heroine), surprised out of all propriety, is represented as utterly overcome by these words, as throwing herself into the arms of her lover, believing, in the delirium of the moment, that it is Satan himself, and uttering these words, “à toi, à toi, ange de bonheur ! à toi et à Dieu pour toujours.” In the course of an historical sketch attached to this romance, a history of heresy is attempted, and these sentences occur:—

“Il n'y a qu'une religion, il n'y a qu'une hérésie. La religion officielle, l'église Constituée a toujours suivi un même système, la religion secrète celle qui cherche encore à se constituer, cette société idéale de l'égalité qui commence à la prédication de Jésus qui traverse les Siècles

du Catholicisme sous le nom d'herésie et qui aboutit chez nous jusqu'à la révolution Française pour se reformer et se discuter, à défaut de mieux, dans les clubs Chartistes et dans l'exaltation communiste. Cette religion la est aussi toujours la même quelque forme qu'elle ait revêtue, quelque nom dont elle se soit voilée quelque persécution qu'elle ait subie. Voilà ce que c'est l'herésie et pas autre chose : une idée essentiellement chrétienne dans son principe, évangélique dans ses révélations successives, révolutionnaire dans ses tentatives, et ses réclamations : et non une stérile dispute de mots une orgueilleuse interprétation des textes sacrés, une suggestion de l'esprit satanique, un besoin de vengeance d'aventures et de vanité comme il a plu à l'Eglise romaine de la définir dans ses requisitoires et ses anathèmes—la doctrine du Christ, la loi de la fraternité sur la terre." This heresy—"Revit aujourd'hui, en partie dans la grande insurrection permanente des Chartistes, et en partie dans les associations profondes et indestructibles du Communisme ; les Communistes, ce sont les Vaudois les pauvres de Lyon, ou Leconistes qui faisaient dès le douzième siècle le métier de canules et l'office de gardiens du feu sacré de l'Evangile ; ses Chartistes, ce sont les Wickléfistes, qui au quatorzième siècle, remuaient l'Angleterre et forçaient Henri V. à interrompre plusieurs fois la conquête de la France." The history of all these sects called heretics—"C'est l'histoire du Joannisme, c'est à dire l'interprétation et l'application de l'Evangile fraternal et égalitaire de St. Jean, C'est la doctrine de l'Evangile eternal ou de la religion du St. Esprit qui remplit tout le moyen-âge et qui est la Clef de toutes ses convulsions, de tous ses mystères."

That is to say, Communism and Chartism are pure expositions of scriptural doctrine and evangelical truth ! Such are the views of an authoress who, whatever may be the stigma attaching to her private life and conduct, enjoys, with a large class of persons, a great reputation, and not undeservedly, for talent ; and whose works are the more to be considered, as they are the careful exposition of a doctrine which is rapidly spreading, and which, with more or less of modification, is held by very many, and especially by the party always existing and always to be dreaded in every state, which finds its interest in any convulsion which may destroy the constituted authority, and whose deficiency in numbers is more than compensated by unity and energy of purpose.

Another peculiar feature of the dogma to which we have alluded is the union of Deism, in its most blasphemous forms, with a strong belief in the existence and agency of the supernatural—a mystic faith, that the perception of the truth, to which these persons lay claim, is the direct result of a divine revelation—how or in what way communicated does not clearly appear. The agency of the supernatural is made use of in the

work called "St. Spiridean,"* and though it occurs in the course of the story, yet it is evident that it also expresses a belief on the part of the writer. In the "Paroles d'un Croyant," by Lamennais, this is directly implied; and in the *travestie* of the "Paroissien," or Roman Catholic Prayer Book, published by the Abbé Chatel, and used by his followers, though everything sacred and supernatural is scoffed at—yet, in the "Apotheoses" of Voltaire, Diderot, Talma the tragedian, and Napoleon (a strange mixture), who are all expressly declared to be fellow-martyrs with our blessed Lord in the great cause of the moral and political regeneration of mankind, such forms of expression are used as plainly manifest the conviction that these, in some mysterious and supernatural way, do still communicate their regenerating views, and impart of their spirit, to the men of enlightened intelligence, who alone, in the present day, as they say, know the truth and possess the key to the right interpretation of Scripture. The idealism of this school is an egoism of the most subtle and selfish character—a real idolatry, difficult of detection, essentially spiritual, but having as many objects of worship as ever distracted the attention, or were accommodated to the various temperaments and dispositions of heathenism. The *ideal* is the *beautiful*, and the beautiful is a something not yet, in its completeness, existing—a spiritual conception of excellence which has as yet no bodily form, but which is to be desired and aspired after; and this excellence is sure to contain, as a part and parcel of its constitution, some quality of mind or heart—some power of intelligence or grace of imagination, which each supposes himself to possess above his fellows. Thus every man is the god of his own idolatry, and an overweening vanity is gratified and gloated to the full under the specious pretence of having an enlightened and intelligent apprehension and adoration of the beautiful: be it moreover observed, that the aspirations after this idealistic beautiful, in its completeness, are not that, by its application in practice, others may be benefitted and blessed; but that, in its possession, he who is gifted with it may have something which others have not, and, in so far as he excels them, may have an eminence to which they cannot attain. The benevolence of French philosophy, and the philanthropy of French *egalistes* and republicans, are alike hollow and unreal; the morality of Voltaire and Rousseau—their satires and their vanity, are a fitting comment upon the one; the mercies of Murat and Robespierre are the

* By the same authoress.

true exposition of the other. The views of these men are spreading, and they want but opportunity and fitting circumstances to produce the same results. We have pointed to France because it is rife with the unregulated and dangerous *spiritualism* of which we have spoken—because this spiritualism, always existing, is a powerful ingredient in the constitution of man, and is more generally manifested in the present day than ever. It is an element in man which statesmen too commonly overlook, or lightly think of, in their calculations; but, nevertheless, if any good results are to be anticipated, it must be considered and provided for in any system of popular education which may be proposed. It is from the influence of the spiritual in man that all great moral revolutions have taken place.

Fanaticism, whether political or religious, has ever been considered as a mental phenomenon, *sui generis*, for which there was no accounting—an interruption of the usual and proper operation of the laws which regulate the human mind and its associations; nevertheless, it is as sequential as other effects, which are well known to be inseparable from their causes; but the cause must be sought elsewhere than in the mental. It is the yielding of those capacities, whereby God is known and divine truth chiefly apprehended, to the direction of influences opposed to his will and his law. The mind and its powers, being the proper handmaids of the spirit, where the latter is kept in subjection and obedience to God, are wholesomely and wisely regulated—are developed in forms of blessing and benefit. But where the spirit is freed from this subjection, the whole mental being of man becomes lawless, his perceptions of right and wrong perverted, and oftentimes the moral disease which we know by the name of fanaticism breaks forth in forms of individual suffering, the infliction of cruelty upon others, and the shedding of blood, as the symptoms of its existence. The direful calamities which marked the progress of John Ziska and his Taborites are amongst the most fearful ever known; the relentless cruelties of Cromwell's stern religionists, and the cold-blooded ferocities of the French revolutionists, are each, in their kind, specimens of what the spirit of man, unregulated by the fear of God and delivered to a Satanic influence, will effect—are each examples of the nature and power of the rule which that influence assumes over the right perceptions of the mind and the better feelings of the heart. If we do not read the Scriptures falsely and fancifully, it is from such combination of the infidel and the spiritual, as seems to characterize the increasing votaries of the doctrine of equality throughout Christendom, that the last apostasy is to be

constituted, and from which the Church of God is to expect her final assault, conflict, and suffering.

It seems to be tacitly acknowledged, that religious considerations should never influence the mind of the statesman in the schemes which he devises for general application and public benefit. A stand is made on the ground of this (assumed) universal consent, and whoever should endeavour to throw the minister upon his responsibility as a Christian, and remind him that he has to legislate for Christian men, is almost sure to be greeted with an ironical cheer in Parliament, and to be considered as a visionary out of it. Such a course, it is said, in the one place, is uncourteous, unparliamentary—hampers the minister as a public functionary, and distresses him as a gentleman. A little exercise of rhetoric on his part—a clever appeal to the liberal feeling and good sense of those around, in the tone, half of injured innocence, half of covert sarcasm, does the business; and the unfortunate individual who has committed the mistake of fancying that he was addressing a body of Christian men speedily discovers his error, and learns, if he did not till then know it, that by the magical operations of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, and some other concoctions of these liberal times, the Legislature of this country has ceased essentially and nationally to be *Christian*,* as it has ceased, by the operation of other Acts, to be *Protestant*. We mean nothing in the slightest degree disrespectful to the members of the Legislature individually, amongst whom we know are numbered many kind hearts, noble minds, and truly Christian sentiments of feeling; but we regret it as a fact, that through the lax views, opposing interests, or want of real faith, on the part of a body in it, a due consideration of that which is truly spiritual and religious should become, by rule or custom, a breach of propriety. It seems to us, for instance, that it is folly, and a manifestation of unstatesmanlike ignorance, for the house to deliberate upon systems of popular education without duly weighing and considering to what extent the spiritual in man, and the true directors of the spiritual, must be taken into account—a want of moral courage

* We use the word *Christian* in the sense in which the Church in all ages has used it. No body recognizing, for instance, Jews and Socinians as its constituted members, would ever ecclesiastically be called essentially *Christian*. It is in this sense simply that we say the Legislature has ceased to be *Christian*: far be it from us to say that it is not composed, for the most part, of Christian men. Its collective character is one thing—the individual characters of its members another. It is a fact that it recognizes in its constitution men who cannot ecclesiastically be called Christian, or does not require such a profession of faith as must necessarily exclude them. With the political propriety of doing this we do not here meddle—that is another question.

and sound judgment not to assert for the Church her true and proper place and privilege in the carrying of such systems into effect, because there are parties in the State who, from liberalism or dissent, object severally to all spiritual rule whatever, or to her doctrines in particular. Such legislation as, by concession to the divided interests of the few, sacrifices the true well-being of the greater mass, is something worse than want of judgment. It is the policy, unfortunately, of the day—it is as devoid of right and sound principle as it will be found fruitful with evil; for undue concessions are the sure signs of a failing power; and the Governments which can only maintain their positions by the multiplied and multiplying cessions of privileges and rights (justly grounded), at the instance of party clamour, must finish by succumbing to the monster, whose voracity they have thought to subdue by the pleasant savour of the dainties they have thrown to him. Now we venture to assert, in the matter of education, that *the mass* is the labouring poor of the country—baptized and received to Christian fellowship in the faith of the Church nationally recognized in England, and legitimately under the care of her ministers; and *the few*, though they may be *many numerically* in comparison, and the *exception*, are the children of Roman Catholics and other Dissenters; for the Roman Catholic is in the position of a Dissenter here, whatever he be elsewhere. If the regulation of the spiritual in man be a true part of education, then of necessity must the Church be associated with the State in any system which is contemplated. If it be of importance, and we think it of the highest, that the spiritual be rightly cared for, then is it the duty of the statesman, as well as his interest, to see that it be placed in duly qualified and authorized hands. The whole question rests upon the faith, whether there is, or is not, such a region as the spiritual in man—whether, if there be, God has, or has not, provided for its necessities, and given power and authority amongst men for its right direction. We do not see how any one conversant with the history of man in the past, and acquainted with the present, can doubt the first—we do not understand how any one acknowledging this, and cognizant of the dreadful calamities that have ever attended its misdirection and aberration, can refuse to admit the second.

In the metropolitan towns and manufacturing districts, but more particularly the latter, popular education has been carried to a vast extent, though in a great measure apart, as we conceive, from legitimate authority. From the Sunday-school to the Mechanics' Institute and Athenæum, every age and every operative class has been provided for, and very many [have

availed themselves of this provision. It is usual to point to these as modified illustrations of the happy results attending a *liberal* system of education for the lower classes; by which is meant, a system apart from peculiar religious views or government. We venture to doubt whether these results are so beneficial as they appear; and we would add, deferentially and respectfully, to those who do not think with us, that we do so from a personal and somewhat extensive experience of the practical working of the system in one of the largest towns in the kingdom. Of the Sunday-schools we do not hesitate to say, that, in many instances, they are the fertile seed-beds of religious divisions and unsound doctrines; whilst they are the sadly certain, though it may be unintentional, fosterers of social irreverence. One use that is made of them is that of a decoy. Every fresh sect (and fresh sects are constantly arising in these districts) proposing to proselyte a neighbourhood, and build a chapel for its worship, first erects the Sunday-school, to furnish in its scholars the germ of future congregations, and to derive from their relatives present countenance and support. What has been intended for a purpose of great and general benefit thus becomes a means of multiplying division, and the scholars submitted to the direction of teachers, not always wise, mostly uninformed, oftentimes holding unsound and dangerous religious views, and fiercely sectarian, are not likely to receive wholesome and reverent notions of the mutual relations of social life; and if they think at all, most probably grow up to be, in their turn, active propagators of the errors in which they have been indoctrinated. Parental affection is, from many causes, much weakened in the districts of which we speak—home and its associations almost unknown to one large portion of the population; and the Sunday-school, whilst it steps in benevolently to rescue the child from sharing the degrading vices of the parent, too frequently offers a premium to the indolence of the latter, and satisfies the feeble remnant of his conscience, as to his responsibility for the right instruction of his offspring in the fear of God, with the specious reason, that it can be done with no care or trouble to himself, and much better by the teacher of the Sunday-school. The child is, at any rate, out of the way—there are so much more time and opportunity for the degrading amusements which commonly constitute the workman's relaxation from labour. On the other hand, the scholar is too often directly taught, and as a natural consequence feels, that subjection is due to the teacher, rather than to the parent. His faint perceptions of filial obedience are gradually obliterated, and he becomes, if he is the subject of what are *called* religious impressions, the spiritually proud rebuker of his

father's vices, and, from a false notion of his duty to God, the resister of his authority. Thus the tie between parent and child, already from force of circumstances loosened, is still further relaxed, if not altogether broken; and this, we take it, is an evil so serious as effectually to counterbalance any amount of instruction which the unauthoritative teaching of these schools can give.

The whole manufacturing system, especially as regards *factories*, is of necessity destructive of the social ties and affections. We do not speak of the master, with whom there is no reason why these should not be in as full force as with others; we speak of the workman, whose gain is in proportion as these are set at naught, and who, in some instances, is compelled to choose between the alternative of bread or their abnegation. Home, with all its blessed associations of peace to the spirit and its compensating pleasures, even for the poorest—home, which, notwithstanding the many abatements that may be made from the poetry of the word in the deadening realities, the uncleanness, and the discomforts of miserable penury, has yet a charm for the meanest, incomprehensible as it may be to the hard philosophical legislators of our day, who know so little of the poor man, his feelings, and his wants, and who, in their utter disregard of both, have well nigh set the land in a flame from one end to the other—home, as a household word, is fast becoming *obsolete* amongst the operatives of the factories; for the associations that compose it either do not exist, or are so rent as to have little hold on the mind and heart. The wife toils from morning till night by the side of her pale and work-worn husband; the cares of her household devolve upon some stranger, of a penury so abject as to be tempted by the scanty pittance that can be spared from their labour—oftentimes some crone, whom suffering has hardened into vicious selfishness, with all the avarice of age, without the power to gratify it. The pains of maternity seize her by the side of the loom; when they come upon her there is no joy for her that a man-child is born into the world; she counts with fretful impatience the hours she is compelled to abstract from her daily occupation; she gives her babe as soon as she is able to the care of others, and only wishes it to live that it may repay, at some future period, in the price of its labour, the loss of time she has suffered by its appearance. The cleanly though humble hearth prepared by the care of the poor but affectionate wife—the little happy faces of those who roll all day long in the sunshine, and struggle with the healthy breeze—the greeting of mother and child, which compensate the weary labourer on his return—this, as regards the poor factory operative, is but a poetical fiction. Parents, without a pang, com-

mit their children, at the earliest possible age allowed, to a toil which deadens the lamp of life almost ere it has begun to beam, and view without emotion, or it may be thought or care, the freshness and joyousness of spirit proper to youth prematurely supplanted by the worn expression of over-wrought strength, and by that sense of suffering from oppression which becomes callous indifference, because relief is alike unknown and unlooked-for. In vain are all legislative enactments for ameliorating the condition of these unhappy classes. The system is too strong alike for legislative benevolence or private philanthropy—it continually offers a premium to parental cruelty. By long disuse, and through dire necessity, parental affection has been blunted, and enactments for the protection of the children become inoperative, because the parents themselves connive at their evasion. It is no uncommon thing, when the Government commissioner expresses a doubt as to the age of the child which he may observe in the factories, for both parent and child to swear that the latter is of the age required, and yet, upon his subsequently taking the child apart, for the truth to be elicited that such is not the fact, and that the child has been induced to swear to a falsehood by the threats of the parent.

We are not, in this description, drawing from the resources of a diseased fancy—we have no desire to exaggerate an evil which, alas ! needs no exaggeration to the reality of its misery. We know what we say to be true, for we have seen it in its worst form ; and if any need a proof of it, they have only to consult the various Government reports that from time to time have been published upon the subject. We do not blame the workman—we do not blame the master. Both are the necessary slaves of their condition ; and the latter oftentimes, with noble generosity, spares no expense to alleviate the suffering which he sees, but which he cannot prevent. It is the monster system upon which the blame must rest ; and its existence is so necessary (as we are told) to the well-being of the nation, that the evils inseparable from it are unavoidable. It is, nevertheless, deplorable ; and whilst political economists vaunt its advantages and dilate with proud satisfaction on the eminence to which it has raised this country in the scale of nations, the philanthropist can only mourn at the fearful cost of human happiness and the amount of individual suffering which it takes to make up this greatness—the Christian can only commend the sufferers unto God, lift his heart to him, and long for the day when man shall no more make gold out of the life's-blood of his brother.

Whatever, therefore, may be the amount of secular instruction afforded by these schools—and the amount is exaggerated—

it is certain that the system, as it *is carried out*, is attended with a positive evil in its effect upon the social condition of the labouring classes in the districts alluded to. If religious divisions are hurtful to the State and to the general well-being of society, as we think they are, then be it remembered there is no such sure method of multiplying and perpetuating them as in the system where almost the only authority recognized is private opinion, and where the Scriptures are submitted to interpretations as various as are the diversities of mental perception and intelligence brought to bear upon them. Standards and professions of faith there are, of a kind, amongst the various bodies of Dissenters; but, as they are constituted, they have no just claim to be considered as Catholic, or as possessing the authority of the Church, which is one, holy and apostolic. They are regarded with little reverence by, and have but little effect upon, those to whom the teaching of the children of Sunday-schools is generally committed; whilst, in many instances, they not only reject truth, but contain and assert positive heresy. In these remarks, the Sunday-schools which are under the immediate superintendence of the Church are, as a matter in course, excepted; because there is in their government an authority which is recognizable; because the Church is responsible, not only to God (a responsibility which may be asserted by all), but responsible to the State for their proper management; because, in the personal attendance and supervision of the clergyman, himself responsible to authority, society at large has a pledge and guarantee that the children shall be well and soundly instructed, not only in the doctrines of divine truth, but in the true nature of their own duty in every relation of life, and in that condition wherein it may have pleased God to set them. The intention of these observations is *not to deny the utility* of a Sunday-school; on the contrary, it is acknowledged to be, in competent hands, a very efficient instrument for the right communication of religious instruction; but to make that just abatement, which the case warrants, from the encomiums passed upon a system, of which the Sunday-school forms a part, wherein all are to teach what doctrines they please—wherein the amount of secular information imparted is the primary thing considered, compared with which the religious instruction afforded is held to be of secondary importance, both as to the matter taught and manner of teaching.

To the Sunday-school has been added the Mechanics' Institute, expressly intended for the instruction of the operative classes in the higher branches of knowledge; and of late years also the Athenæum—a species of club, whose object is to furnish

the clerk, the shopman, and the warehouseman with comforts, and even luxuries, for the body and the mind, which in any other way are not within their reach. Philosophical and scientific lectures are part of the plan upon which both are conducted—the comforts of a better meal at a moderate price, with the luxury of an elegant reading-room and an extensive library, are amongst the characteristics of the latter; but it must not be forgotten that the ultimate end of either is *education*—they are parts of a system of popular education. It does not signify whether they have or have not been recognized by the State—they are parts of a system which the liberalists of this day especially advocate; and it is with the tendency, philosophy, and spirit of such systems that we are dealing. It is proposed by such institutions (and it is asserted that the end is gained) to rescue the classes whose benefit they contemplate from the degrading pursuits and amusements which too commonly fill up the leisure hours of the unintelligent operative and shopman, by giving them such an amount of knowledge and taste for literature as shall enable them to occupy their hours profitably to themselves and to others. The Institute and the Athenæum are offered instead of the public-house and the theatre. Now, no one for an instant, who has any right feeling upon the subject, can say that the objects which are proposed are not good, and the evils which are sought to be counteracted are not such. Our question is not as to the *intention*, but the *means*—whether these means are not of such a nature as to induce an evil, in lieu of the one which it is sought to remedy—not so palpable, not so gross nor so shocking in its developments, but, in reality, greater in its moral amount and the importance of its results. We have the same objection to make, viz., that in the Mechanics' Institute and the Athenæum there is no provision made for such an authoritative religious instruction as, giving right principles, shall direct every acquisition of knowledge to a wholesome and useful end. It is very true that the clergyman has his proper sphere, as well as every other person; that it would neither be beneficial nor decorous to thrust him, in the plenitude of his ecclesiastical office, upon every scene of secular employment, or recreation, or even of social life. His place is not, as a *clergyman*, exactly in the lecture-room of the Institute, nor the library or eating-room of the Athenæum—nor would anything but impatience and irritation be gained by his constant attendance as a spiritual monitor, to check whatever, in his opinion, might not be consistent with propriety and truth; all this we know, and it is not of such a superintendence that we speak, but of such a prior instruction and care—such an influence in the formation

of these societies and institutions as shall save those for whose benefit they are devised from the rationalism, infidelity, and dangerous political tendencies which, without that instruction—without that influence—must be expected as their results; for the system is one wherein knowledge is imparted without reference to the capacity for receiving it, or the wisdom necessary for its right application, and wherein comfort and luxury are dispensed without a wholesome consideration of the legitimate necessities of the recipients, what is proper to their condition, or what may probably and honestly be within their means to compass thereafter, when they become heads of houses and fathers of families. Again we say that these institutions are, for the most part, the work of those who design them to be a means of popular education, and who advocate the so-called liberal principle of excluding religious instruction, as *primarily necessary*, in a national system of education for the people; or, if permitting it, leaving it to be imparted according to the particular opinions or wishes of the parties interested, without any concern to ascertain whether the teacher be rightly authorized, or the doctrine taught sound.

It is a favourite maxim with the liberals of the present day, whether religious or political, that *knowledge is power*; and the maxim is continually quoted, in order to prove the importance of giving it to the people. It is said that the possession of knowledge endues a man with such a force of perception, right judgment, and moral strength, as will effectually prevent him from becoming the dupe of the priest, or a slave in the State; and it is argued, that as freedom from priestcraft, and a proper understanding of the rights and privileges of liberty and free citizenship, are amongst the choicest blessings of an enlightened civilization, so the greater amount of knowledge you can impart to the people, the more will these blessings be appreciated and realized. Certainly, priestcraft and oppressive rule are great evils, but infidelity and licentiousness are greater; and from all that can be gathered from the definitions which have issued from the schools of liberalism, there seems to be but little right understanding of that *via mediâ* wherein men may walk with holy and reverent subjection to Christ in his Church, and intelligent obedience to constituted authorities in the State, without the enslaving of their consciences or the prostration of their liberty. Truth always requires, in its exposition, to be treated as a whole. It may be so handled as, by separation of its proper relative parts, to countenance error and maintain contraries. The truth of God, and there is no other, is, for example, one vast and harmonious whole, of which the several proposi-

tions, though they be each truths, do not serve the purpose of truth, unless they be preserved in their right relation to each other. Thus it is a truth that knowledge is power, but it is a truth which cannot for its right application stand alone, and may be so perverted, when taken separately, as to become the parent of dangerous errors. There are other truths, such as that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," and that wisdom is the master principle by which knowledge, in its application, should be directed and controlled. Whilst it is true that "knowledge is power," yet it is almost certain that, apart from its proper relation to these truths, it is a power which will prove, in its exercise, as destructive and baneful as it is specious and fascinating. There is a knowledge of evil as well as of good, which is not wisdom—there is a power of darkness as well as of light, whose nature is to blight and destroy, as that of the other is to bless and to save; and he who possesses knowledge, and exercises it not in the fear of God, sows, wherever he goes, the seeds of misery for himself and others, and is the master of a power which he can never put forth without inflicting injury, even though he intend it not. Knowledge, whether it be of things physical or metaphysical, requires wisdom for her guide. To be the handmaid of this holy mistress, to attend to her behests, to submit the many resources and munitions of our treasure stores to her direction—this is the place of knowledge, in the fulfilling of which the power will be manifested as of God, and the fruits as those of righteousness unto eternal life. To the man of wisdom, there are health and peace in knowledge; to him the wondrous riches of nature are revealed, as to a trusty steward, whose office is to use them for his Master's honour; every object that he beholds teaches him a lesson of truth; all things speak to him of God—of him whom it is life to know and peace to trust. The flower of the field—the tree of the forest—all animate creation, from man in the completeness of his being, to the insect of an hour, speak to his heart in forms of thought, all glorious and beautiful, and with many-tongued voices of majesty and sweetness, and the burthen of their tale is one—that God is good, "the heavens declare his glory, the firmament showeth his handiwork; day unto day uttereth speech—night unto night showeth knowledge;" whilst ever and anon, in the deep recesses of his own spirit, there are a thousand breathings of the immortal principle within him, which, passing from things seen to things unseen—from knowledge of what is, to the anticipation of what may be—tell, in language which he alone can understand, of the wondrous glory of that rest which remaineth for him in the dispensation yet to

be revealed. Without this holy association of wisdom and knowledge, the possession of the latter is a curse, and not a blessing. It is the strength of the giant, and the mischief of the madman, or the folly of the fool, united ; it becomes, in its exercise, hurtful to the possessor, and those around him. The secrets of nature to him who knows not God, and sees not God in all his works, do but, in their unfolding, minister pride unto destruction. Materialism and infidelity, or intellectual idolatry—these are the fruits of unsanctified knowledge—the sure results of a system which, in endeavouring to enlighten man apart from God and without the Church, lifts him out of his sphere in social life, and gives him an inflated notion of his own importance, which is as groundless as it is hurtful.

“A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.”

There is a point in its acquisition wherein conceit, once engendered, is increased, according to the number of subjects attempted, and exactly in proportion to the superficiality of acquaintance with them. The system to which we are alluding supposes each man subjected to it to be naturally a genius—to be endowed with mental capacities for the comprehension of the higher branches of science : but such, it is notorious, is not the fact, and if the poet's assertion be true, the dangerous condition of which he speaks is brought to pass in the imparting of a little amount of knowledge, which cannot be increased, because there is not sufficient capacity for its reception—which cannot be practically applied to benefit, because the nature of the subjects require a deeper acquaintance with them, and whose result has been to give the possessor an unfounded and exaggerated estimation of his own acquirements and abilities. It is, moreover, a very doubtful thing whether, supposing such a case possible, it is consistent with the happiness of a nation that all its subjects be deep thinkers and skilful debaters, having that acquaintance with every branch of knowledge which shall enable them to decide judgmentally upon all points of interest occurring in the polity and government of a State ; but it surely is no blessing to have the people converted into that class of debaters and thinkers, who, with but a superficial knowledge of principles, claim for themselves and their opinions the privileges and estimation of men fully informed and justly entitled to give a verdict. Now this is exactly the position in which these *Mechanics' Institutes* are putting the labouring classes, and the *Athenæums* will do the like for those a grade above them. Whence have the *Chartists* and *Socialists* of our manufacturing districts their

mental and political aliment? Whence the theories of government, of political economy, and the statistical information of which they make so clever an use? Whence but from the lecture-room of the Mechanics' Institute? It may be answered, that it is not intended that they should make the use they do of them. This is an answer in which *the whole* of those who patronize the system could not honestly join, and even if they could, does not mend the case; for clearly that system is answerable for the evil effects that it produces, which does not anticipate them and provide against them.

In the Chartists and Socialists we have a fair sample of what the lecture-room will do for the masses, unaccompanied and unpreceded by a wholesome religious instruction. It will render them specious debaters—false, but showy reasoners—self-satisfied, and, by consequence, impatient of rebuke or control—discontented with their own position, and covetous of every one above them, without the slightest idea that there are ever compensating burdens, cares, and responsibilities peculiar to each, which, when closely viewed, destroy the golden illusion that distance gives them. The Chartists and Socialists of this land are but the English edition of French republicans, communists, and fraternists. The sound sense of the better classes of our countrymen has hitherto erected a barrier to the irruption of their utopian doctrines—has both circumscribed the bounds of their demonstration, and compelled their development in forms of definite and unequivocal antagonism; but it is not to be concealed that the ramifications of these doctrines have at length passed the boundaries within which it was sought to confine them, and under less obnoxious forms, and with more philosophic names, have stricken into soils which aristocracy and high Conservative principle have heretofore called exclusively their own. The reasoning of both Chartist and Socialist, in politer terms and more accommodating phraseology, finds its way into the higher places of the land; and the host of flashy debaters whom the Anti-Corn Law League, in its pure philanthropy and hatred of monopoly, has paid and sent forth to instruct the people, from one end of the land to the other, in the miseries which are inflicted upon them by the landlord, and the great blessings that would accrue to them if the manufacturer could double the wealth he possesses—these debaters do continually, in their theoretic definitions of what is and what is not good for the people, make manifest the near relationship of their views to the doctrines which have once produced the most direful calamity that the world has ever witnessed, and will again, unless God avert it, write their true character in letters of

anarchy, bloodshed, and suffering, on every threshold, from the palace to the cottage, throughout Christendom.

It should be remembered that the districts where Mechanics' Institutes and Athenæums are most rife are just those where the evils, which, in the absence of a wise superintendence, must flow from them, are most likely to be nourished—where, from force of circumstances, they will ever find materials for their sustenance and growth; for there is no place in the world where practical science has accomplished so much, and achieved so many triumphs—where machinery exists in such perfection—where the inventive genius of man has been so wonderfully developed, and the mighty powers of steam so successfully applied—and where, by consequence, there is so much ground for intellectual pride, and a high estimate of what man, as man, is able to effect. The same vanity that exalts man above his true position dethrones God; and the transition is not difficult, from the reasoning which would prove that the only creative principle is mind,* to that which would demonstrate that there is no higher deity than the human intellect. Into this direful error too many of the operatives fall, and they owe their fall undoubtedly to the specious, but unwholesome and unsound education which they receive in the institutions of which we speak. It is forgotten that discovery and the faculty of combination are not creation, and that the utmost stretch to which the human mind has been able to attain is the discovery, by force of observation, of some of the principles that operate to produce the various phenomena which we see on every hand, and then, by skilful combination, the production of results through the action of machinery, somewhat similar, in an almost infinitesimal degree, to the mighty and wondrous harmonies which work together for the composition of the elements, the change of the seasons, the movement of the heavenly bodies, and the sustenance of this glorious universe—the handiwork of God. But of the generative powers that the physical world contains how little has yet been ascertained! and what an immeasurable distance lies between the discovery of the principles that exist, and the bringing of these principles into existence! The one is proper to man in the highest condition of intellectual cultivation—the other is the prerogative of God alone.

The Athenæum professes to provide, for a certain class, com-

* In the town to which allusion has been made, a series of lectures was advertised not very long ago to be delivered by an Unitarian minister. The first in the series was to prove the proposition that "the only creative principle in the universe is *mind*"—the second was to show "man's relation to mind."

forts and luxuries, which their unaided condition would not enable them to obtain for themselves; and to furnish them with such cultivated tastes, as shall thereafter, when they have homes and families of their own, be a constant resource and comfort to them in the probable difficulties of their positions. There is another view of this subject which ought to occur, but which is seldom heeded. What is the true social condition of this class? What is likely to be their condition hereafter? If their present social condition be one which does not legitimately furnish them with these appliances as proper to it—if their condition hereafter is likely to be one of scanty means, then habits are acquired and tastes induced which will give them a dislike to the homes of their relatives before they are married, and make them impatient and disgusted with the privations of their own, when they become, in their turn, fathers of families, and have to keep house upon the scale which is reasonably to be expected as belonging to their condition. A gentleman's habits and a shopman or a warehouseman's salary are sorry partners—they must sooner or later disagree. It is a positive evil to take any man out of his true position, to give him tastes which do not belong to it, and which he cannot thereafter, consistently with his duty, gratify. It is becoming a serious complaint that the club system is everywhere effecting a great revolution in social life; that the relations and associations of home are irretrievably broken by it; and that an amount of luxury is placed at the ready command of young men which they cannot find in their domestic circles, and which they will be unable to secure thereafter, unless at the expense of the neglected duties of their own households. The effect, as a whole, is to give an additional impulse to that restless spirit which makes every man in the present day grasp after the privileges, pursuits, and enjoyments of the rank above him.

The question will now be asked, "What, then, would you have? Would you have the people remain for ever in a condition of ignorance, as debasing as it is unnecessary and prejudicial?" We would not; and even if we desired it, the desire is no longer attainable. It has been already remarked, that a condition of ignorance is no longer *nationally* possible; that no matter what the means may be which have been employed, *as a fact*, such an amount of information has been communicated as delivers the nation from the stigma of popular ignorance, and lays upon it the burden of rightly providing for, and meeting, the demand for extended instruction which the onward movement of the mind (not to be coerced or repressed) in every class has generated. We would have a system of education

wherein *primarily* the spiritual in man should be cared for—wherein religious instruction should be authoritatively and soundly imparted—and wherein, in the communication of all other knowledge, due regard should be had to the average amount of capacity for its reception and the probable uses to which it should lawfully be applied. This cannot be done *nationally*, unless the State associate with herself the Church; and give to the latter her proper place and influence—nor *effectually*, unless the number of her ministers be increased. The difficulties that lie in the way are the objections of Dissenters to submit to such a system, which objections a statesman, to their just extent, must consider; and the want of those means which the Government fears the people will not warrant it in supplying, and which it has not the courage, or the hardihood it may be, to demand. The former is the most serious obstacle of the two, because greater weight is given than properly belongs to it; because, in the morbid fear of committing an intolerant act, the just limits of toleration are forgotten, and a continual injustice committed towards the true standing and claims of *the Church*, which, by the constitution of this country, is recognized as that of the land, which the supreme authorities have pledged themselves to maintain and uphold; because, in short, the objections, the laxity, and the spirit of dissent find a sympathy oftentimes in the hearts of those who, from their position, are required to legislate protectively for the Church. The operation of their measures is consequently paralyzed by the reluctance with which they are framed, or rendered baneful by the false position in which it is intended they should place her.

It cannot be denied that the masses of this country consider themselves, and really are, as far as their baptism, and requiring the aid of the Church when they need, can make them, members of the Church of England. In all debates upon the subject the clergy are made responsible for the care and supervision of them, though, whenever anything is to be gained by a display of numbers, every artifice is resorted to, to prove that they belong to this or that body, apart from the Church, or are so indifferent to all spiritual claims as, at any rate, to belong to none; and it is more unjust, with such an amount of responsibility as rests upon her, that the rights, privileges, and means for the discharge of her duty should be infringed upon and diminished to appease the clamour of parties, than that the claims of these parties should be deferred to her efficiency. The position of a king in the State is that of the master of a household—the father of a family; he may, in the mercy of toleration, dispense with the

observance of certain rules from those of his household who cannot conscientiously observe them; he may even permit them to observe others which do not properly come within his family circle, so long as they do not interfere with the order and peace of his household; but the case becomes materially different when they require him to alter his rules, so that distinctions may cease, and that they themselves may no longer be the exception; and this especially when he has received his estate in trust to administer its proceeds in the maintenance of a certain status, and the conservation in his household of a certain establishment and certain observances. One duty of a father is to provide for the religious instruction of his children. One duty of a king, also, is to see that his subjects be in this respect properly cared for, always taking it for granted that the household and the nation, the father and the king, are Christian. The father will make this provision according to the faith which he himself professes; for in his place, as *father*, no one in his house is higher than he; the king will make it according to the way which the wisdom of his ancestors and the consent of the nation point out and render binding upon him in his coronation vow; because his paternal relation to his people is so far modified, that whilst he is not released from the responsibility of caring for their welfare, he is not left to the unbiassed exercise of his individual will; because, where the happiness of thousands is concerned, it is not good that it should depend upon the accidents incidental to the exercise of an arbitrary and despotic power centred in a fallible man. In this respect, the king is no more coerced by the law than a father, who, whilst he may bring up his children in his own faith, may not do it so as that the requisitions of the law be either evaded or transgressed. Moreover, the faith of the king is, *ex officio*, the faith of the nation—the faith which is nationally recognized; and what the father does by inclination and a sense of duty, the king also is required to do by the terms of the law and the covenant which he makes with the people. As long, therefore, as the Church of England is that which is legally and nationally recognized, it is the duty of the Government, as being the king's executive, to provide for the religious instruction of his subjects in those doctrines and according to that ritual which she authoritatively sanctions; and if it be necessary that a national system of education should involve a provision for such instruction, as of primary importance, then it is clear that the clergyman must be associated with the schoolmaster, and that the chief place, if not the entire superintendence, should be conceded to him.

It is not meant by this that Dissenters should be compelled

to send their children to the parish church or school ; although we hold that the objections commonly urged to doing so have seldom any validity. Thoroughly sifted, they exhibit more of moral disease than healthful truth ; and whilst claiming consideration on the ground of sincerity or conscientious conviction that there is spiritual error on the part of the Church, they may be frequently traced to reasonings purely political, and that feeling of resistance to authority or control, no matter in what way or by whom exercised, which is one of the characteristics of the day. Be this as it may, they *are objections*, and they *must be* considered ; the spirit of the age renders this necessary, and where they are conscientiously entertained, we would be the last to say that they do not merit nor require consideration. But something more than consideration is asked for—a footing of equality with the Church of England is demanded, and, by immediate consequence (since exception cannot then be legitimately claimed by any), the establishment, as in France, of that condition where religionists of every creed, and deniers of all, are not only tolerated, but mostly maintained by the State ; for, says Chapuys Montlaville, in an answer to M. De Lamartine, recently published—

“ Toute société religieuse, croyance ou *système philosophique*, qui a un corps, une existence réelle, régulière, peut se produire, et non-seulement a le droit d’émettre et de prêcher sa doctrine, mais est favorisée encore de la grâce de l’Etat.”

“ Le culte catholique est celui de plus de trente millions de Français ; il est salarié par l’Etat en proportion des besoin de ses trente millions de fidèles.”

“ Le culte protestant avec ses sectes multiples est salarié, protégé également.”

“ Il n’est pas jusqu’à la religion de Moïse qui ne possède ses temples du chef de l’Etat, et qui n’ait ses ministres payés.”

Every sound-thinking man will admit that this is a condition greatly to be deprecated. Whatever be the fascination of the theory, the history of Christendom proves that its practical results have been civil discord and foreign strife—civil discord, because equality is an impossible condition for human nature to maintain—foreign strife, because latitudinarianism in religion is the sure companion of republicanism in states ; and all well-governed and constituted nations have, sooner or later, to make common cause against the aggressive efforts of that restless spirit which these two evils are sure to generate—the missionary of darkness and the contaminator of all that is healthful in society with the moral plague of insubordination. Where such a condition is recognized, monarchy must fall, or, standing only on such bases as the pub-

lic will may erect or remove at pleasure, owns, at the best, but a precarious existence. Where there is no national Church, there is no national monarch. Equality of creeds supposes that there is no authority for the decision of truth but private judgment; and, by a natural and easy consequence, that kingly power is not an ordinance of God, but of the will of the people: hence there is no national religion in France; and the King is, therefore, not "the King of France," but "*the King of the French.*" This recognition of all creeds is asserted by some to be a proof of the exceeding care of the State for the religious welfare of its subjects; it is no such thing—it is an utter indifference to it. It is neither more nor less than this language on the part of the rulers: "We consider the whole subject so speculative, that we leave you to settle amongst yourselves, by such appliances of reasoning or authority as you may possess, what is truth, and what is not. We fulfil all that can be possibly required of us when we provide sufficient funds for the maintenance of your several ministers; and we leave it to them to shield you from the evils, real or imaginary, attendant upon false doctrines or infidelity—we either do not believe in their existence, or think them imaginary; at any rate, their consideration does not enter, unless they are developed in transgression of the laws, into the subject of State polity. We are not unwilling that the people should be religiously instructed, but we leave you to define amongst yourselves what religious instruction may be, and to provide it without our aid." The terrible error of which is, that the consideration of false doctrines and infidelity does not enter into the science of State polity, and that it is not the duty of a Government nationally to acknowledge God before all Christendom, and so to maintain His Church as that she may be able, in her place, authoritatively to decide what truth is, and to instruct the people in it. The national recognition of any sect which is not *Christian* unchristianizes a nation, as far as that can be done by an act of the Legislature; and the putting it upon an equality with the true Church is a practical denial that there is such a Church at all.

If this condition of society, where all religions are equally recognized, is not to be advocated, then nothing is left but that the State, as in this land, should recognize and uphold the Church of Christ in some form of visible existence; and when this is done, whatever may be claimed in the way of exemption by Dissenters from that form, or demanded in support of some other of which they may approve, whilst it may be granted from tolerance—may be bestowed as a grace, cannot, we humbly conceive, be insisted upon as a right, for the same right and

privilege cannot belong in common to opposing parties where precedence is involved: these are the property of one or other of them, and that to which the law attaches them can alone justly, in a civil sense, claim them. If the State, therefore, in this country, devolve the education of the poor upon the clergy, as we think she ought, then, whilst she does not exact that the children of Dissenters should be submitted to their rule, she cannot so recognize and grant the claim of the latter to a separate provision out of the public funds, as to render the authority and position of the former nationally null. If she aids at all, it should be in such a way as unequivocally to express that there is a *truth* which she is determined to uphold, and an *error* which she does not wish to sanction. If the Dissenter says that, at any rate, he ought not to be required to contribute to the maintenance of such a system of education as the State shall determine to carry out by the aid of the Church, then we answer, that the question resolves itself into one of pure politics, as to whether the State can, or cannot, impose a tax upon all for a purpose of which the minority complain; and the objection has no better grounds than that which should induce a man to refuse the payment of an excisable tax because it goes to make up a fund which the Government employs in the carrying on of a war of which *he* does not approve, or in payment of a pension which *he* does not think merited.

Of suffering for conscience sake we hear in these days a great deal—we had almost said *ad nauseam*. In this country toleration is stretched to its utmost limits, and there are few, if any, cases where the law requires what the conscience ought not to be able to yield. We do not say that there are none whatever where the State does not occasionally impose burthens, but these are oftener owing to the peculiar views of the sufferer than to anything inherently or of necessity antichristian or oppressive in the thing imposed. It is clear that the holder of peculiar views, however true he may deem them to be, is neither a wise man if he expects them to be held without cost or sacrifice somewhere, nor a sincere man if he complains immoderately of the suffering which they involve. The sufferers for conscience sake in our day reason as though the whole constitution, both of Church and State, ought to be broken up, in order that a place may be made for the unrestrained exercise of their particular faith. They forget that, in so doing, they would have the burthen and cost of their conscientious view to fall upon those around them—that they, indeed, would gratify the one, devolving the other upon their fellows. An honest man will expect suffering, if he cannot agree with the generality of his brethren;

it is the tax he must pay for his singularity—he knows it, or ought to know it, and will not complain. If this suffering be borne for the Lord's sake, as to be lightly endured it ought to be, society will not be disturbed with the clamorous enumeration by the sufferer of all the items that make up the sum of his endurance. Suffering for conscience sake is, more or less, the sure accompaniment of a truly Christian profession, but it is also a partaker of the meekness and spirit of our blessed Lord; it is, in its spiritual integrity, neither a disturber of states nor a factious breaker-down of the rights, distinctions, and laws of men, especially where these have been framed with reference to Christian precepts, and in a Christian spirit. On the other hand, there are things, which the Church and the State require, to which men object, it may be conscientiously, which they, the Church and State, as conscientiously, and as before God, feel bound to maintain; and it is something like arrogance to ask that these should be foregone that an individual scruple may be gratified—an impossibility, that any administration of Government, ecclesiastical or political, can be so framed as to allow for and meet the scruples of all. We do not say that conscientious scruples are not to be honoured, where they really are such, nor that the ruling powers, as far as is practicable, should not recognize their existence; but if the well-being of a State require that some standard of authority in things spiritual and secular should be established, as the preventive of anarchy, some of necessity must be displaced. Still, that is no reason why there should be no standard at all; or why, if they cannot uphold it, its greater objects should be conceded to their individual prejudices. With those who, assuming the profession of a creed which they claim to be one eminently unworldly and spiritual, are fierce in indignation at the obstacles which consequently naturally result to their attainment of worldly honours and dignities, power and earthly grandeur, we confess we have no sympathy. They are either dishonest or inconsistent—dishonest, to profess such a faith where it does not bear its true fruit in the crucifixion of the flesh and the renunciation of worldly pleasures; or inconsistent, in claiming that which they assert they have renounced. These remarks apply more especially to those who, declaring the government of the Church to be corrupt, her revenues enormous, and her spiritual authority (alas! how little is left!) a tyranny, are yet clamorous, on the ground of the equal rights of citizenship, to a full participation in them, or the possession of something equivalent to them. The old complaint, of hindering a man from holding office in the State because of his religious views, no longer applies.

After all, EDUCATION is a more comprehensive word than it is usually considered to be. The information which the schoolmaster can impart constitutes but a small portion of it. Whatever tends to implant a principle, or form the character, comes within the meaning of the term. The circumstances by which the child is surrounded have a moral influence thereafter upon the life of the man; he is continually, in one shape or another, receiving precepts of good or of evil, and witnessing examples of virtue or vice, differing in degree of force. These, combined with the tuition of the schoolmaster, constitute education. But if the influences of home, or the social rank in which the child moves, be adverse to morality, then mere secular education has no inherent quality of strength sufficient to counteract them. The schoolmaster has little to oppose but an oracular display, or exposition of ethics, which is above the comprehension of the scholar; or personal chastisement, which, whilst it does not eradicate the evil, often renders the subject of it skilful in its concealment. In every case the clergyman is necessary. The parent needs the constant exercise of his pastoral oversight, lest the example of home should destroy the influence of the precept which the child elsewhere receives. The child needs his care, not only as the catechist, but also as the watchful superintendent of every branch of knowledge imparted, in order that the fear of God may be inculcated; and it is the duty of the State to enable the Church authoritatively to effect this by her ministers. What is plainly the *duty* of the State is also her *interest*, for no free Government can be healthfully carried on unless there be an intelligent subjection to the laws. If men do not ground subjection, as a duty, upon the fear of God, and the recognition of his will in the relations of rule and obedience, then subjection is either yielded from fear of punishment alone, or from some imagined just perception of its propriety as a thing necessary to the well-being of society. In the former case, the subjection, which is yielded only to the strong hand of power, changes to licentiousness when that hand is enfeebled. In the latter, the political notions of what is necessary for the well-being of society become so often qualified by the prevailing fashions of popular philosophy as to render such grounds for a continued subjection to the laws unstable, uncertain, and capricious. The State, and all men in the State, ought to learn from the Church—can from the Church alone learn, the truth of God, and get the knowledge of those immutable principles of right and wrong, without which the maxims and theories of political science cannot be rightly framed, or properly apprehended and applied; for, notwithstanding all that has been written against priestcraft and ecclesiasti-

cal abuse—notwithstanding the many instances (too many, alas !) which have been adduced of the existence of both, she is the treasure-house of truth, from whence all right notions and principles are dispensed unto men. The Lord has given her to be the light of the world, and it is from her, as such, that the fires which burn upon the altars of public faith and domestic peace should ever be illumined. It is not meant by this that nothing is known in the world but what is taught by her servants—this is altogether another matter; but that the great master principles by which faith between man and man (whether as between nations, collective bodies, or individuals) should be regulated, and in the light of which all knowledge should be exercised and applied, have been committed by the Lord to the keeping of the Church, by whose servants, endued with holy wisdom, they *ought* ever to be delivered to men for their right direction. Truth, so to speak with reverence, is part and parcel of the divine existence, whose personification was our blessed Lord himself—whose exposition was that which he said and did: it can only be known by revelation to man; man has, inherently, faculties and capacities for discerning and receiving it when it is revealed, but he has none whatever for its origination; for its existence is eternal, and it has, as the truth of God, a completeness, to which nothing can be added, from which nothing can be taken away. All that has ever been known of truth in the world, whether as held by the higher intelligences of heathen philosophy, or the master-minds of modern civilization, may be surely traced to the revelations successively made by the Most High to the patriarchs in the primeval condition of the world—to the Jews in the Mosaic dispensation—to the Gentiles in the Christian. The discoveries in physical science are another matter; but these again are not creations of principles, but the finding out, by force of observation in their effects, somewhat of the laws by which the order, courses, and existence of the various elements in the material world are regulated, through the wisdom of Him who both created the *cause*, and by his mighty power secured the sure *effect*. Oh ! that men knew and recognized the high and lofty calling of the Church—why God has set her in the midst of the world, and what an office He has given to her servants ! Oh ! that we, as his ministers, had minds to comprehend the thoughts, and hearts to contain the peace and blessing, that by his Holy Spirit he would continually pour into them ! The world has too often no higher idea of the Church than as a nursery of doubtful dogmas, the decent and necessary companion of the State, to grace its pageants and assist it in the preservation of order—an institution which must

be maintained whilst there are children to be kept in order, the feeble-minded or the aged to occupy and amuse ; whilst we, who have, or ought to have, higher and better thoughts of all that God has done for her and in her, and would do by her—by our vain and foolish strifes—by our love of ease—by our forgetfulness of our calling and the nature of our warfare—by our grasping after high distinction or fear of abated estimation—by our reluctance to break the sweet and peaceful ties that hold so many of us (all precious though they be), and encounter the rude shock of fierce debates and bitter revilings that threatens on every hand—are proving oftentimes faithless to our trusts, and yielding a show of reason to the accusation, that the Church is but the stronghold of an *order*, and that we only love her and cleave to her because she gives us a standing, and maintains us therein.

If the education of the people devolve properly and primarily upon the Church, and if the State recognize this as a truth, and desire that she take her place in the working out of any system of popular instruction, a difficulty would immediately present itself, in the inadequacy, in point of numbers, of the clergy to the exigency of the case ; but it is a difficulty which should not long exist—one which the inherent energy of the Church, the zeal and self-devotion of her ministers, the faith of her children, ought all to combine and remove. Orders of men, not strictly priestly, yet ecclesiastical—separated to their work under ecclesiastical government—devoted to their task—not undertaking it for hire—contented with little, like the *frères ignorantium*, as we believe they are called, of Roman Catholic countries, might be instituted within the bosom of the Church, with such modifications as might seem good to the bishops ; to these might be committed the primary instruction of the poor in religious truth. Either this, or something like this, must be adopted, or a very great increase in the number of the actual clergy must take place ; for it is clear that the clergy cannot, in their present condition, meet the claims that are made upon them ; and it is equally clear that any system of popular education which recognizes religious instruction as an integral element, and yet leaves it to be administered by untaught, unauthorized, or incompetent persons, will, whilst it seeks to counteract one evil, aggravate another.

The question of public education, as connected with the superintendence of the Church, has been lately, in some of its bearings, extensively agitated in France. A struggle has taken place between the clergy and the university ; the Chamber of Deputies has sided with the latter.

The clergy are accused of wishing to take the direction of education out of the hands of the university, and to monopolize its entire superintendence. This is not the fact: they have only claimed an exemption for themselves. There are in France, besides royal and communal colleges, and private schools, under the government of the university, establishments for education called *petits séminaires*; they are in number one hundred and eighteen, and they contain twenty thousand pupils. Over these the university at present exercises no jurisdiction whatever; they are in the hands of the ecclesiastics. They were originally instituted for the instruction of such children alone as might be devoted to the priesthood; but it is complained that many children who are not destined to the priesthood enter them and come forth from them; and one object of "the Report," to which we shall presently allude, was to propose restrictions in this respect, and to bring the clergy generally, exercising the office of instructors, under the surveillance, as to their qualifications, of the university. To this surveillance the clergy decidedly object.

Much has been written on the subject on both sides; we have thought it worth while to put at the head of this article, as deserving of consideration, three works, as specimens of the *secular* reasoning of those who, in treating the matter, take distinct grounds for their arguments.

The "Rapport Complet" of M. Thiers was the result of a commission composed of MM. de Tocqueville, Thiers, Saint-Marc-Girardin, De Carné, De Salvandy, De Rémusat, Quinette, Odillon Barrot, and Dupin (aîné), president. This commission was appointed to consider and report upon the subject of education, as connected between the clergy and the university, which had of necessity come before the notice of the Chamber. It does not immediately affect the reasoning which has been employed in this article, because it has reference, not to the education of the poor, but to the instruction of the children of those who move in the middle ranks; but it contains, nevertheless, many principles which, in their operation, affect all classes; and we have therefore thought it worth while to bring it before the attention of our readers. There is a great deal of very interesting matter in it relative to the state of the present laws with regard to public education in France, the means for, and method of, its communication, and educational statistics in general. As this matter is not quite relevant to our point, we prefer to direct those who desire the information to the document itself, rather than to make extracts here.

Like all the documents prepared and put forth by M. Thiers,

there are in this report a great amount of ability and no small quantum of sophistry ; a vast deal of literary garnishing, which has little to do with the question really at issue—long passages, which either suppose his audience more ignorant than gentlemen are wont to be, or very willing to pay for an intellectual amusement by the loss of their legislative time, which smack much more also of the *ci-devant* editor than the statesman. Altogether, for an official document, it is a strong and curious contrast to the plain, terse, matter-of-fact papers prepared on this side of the water, which never forget for a moment that the persons addressed are men of sound sense and good information, and never presume to intrude upon them philosophical essays, historical treatises, and rhetorical perorations, where only facts are asked for ; but then *La grande nation* and we are very different people, *et voila tout !*

In this "Report" the case is unfairly stated. It is put as though the clergy were desirous, as *citizens*, of claiming other privileges, other laws, and other authorities, than those which all others, as citizens, enjoy, and to which they are subject. M. Thiers, thus interpreting their position for them, makes a triumphant appeal to the sense of the house against the monstrosity of such pretensions, and his appeal is received with cheers. So much for his fairness, and the perception and judgment of those whom he addresses. Now it is not as *citizens* that the Roman Catholic clergy object to the plan proposed, and claim the exemption alluded to ; but as *priests*—as being the servants and ministers of a Church which, in *spiritual matters*, owns no authority upon earth but its own. It is on this ground that they object to be submitted to the judgment of a secular power as to their competence to undertake the task of education, understanding, as they do, such education to comprise spiritual instruction. This being the true ground of their objection, M. Thiers' very great astonishment, that they should hesitate to accept what all respectable laymen are very well pleased with, might have been spared ; and his very clever reasonings are so much breath lost, for they are altogether beside the mark. Whether the State chooses to allow the claim of the clergy is another matter ; but, in reasoning upon the matter as it stands, it is but right to give them the benefit of their own statement and their true position. The whole difficulty, on the part of the priests, is here. They say, "Education and spiritual government, as far as we have anything to do with education, must go together ; and therefore we cannot submit to a tribunal which has, and can have, no spiritual authority over us whatever." This difficulty M. Thiers and his colleagues steadily refuse to look at, not recognizing, nor desiring to

recognize, the fact, that the spiritual, as a part of education, belongs exclusively to the clergy. Moreover, the clergy directly affirm that the colleges are filled with the doctrines of the day—that liberalism and covert infidelity abound in the lecture-room, and are promulgated with all the dangerous advantages and influence which the chair of the professor can give. On this account, they say, they are not willing to submit those, who are hereafter to become ecclesiastics, to the required course. This objection M. Thiers again answers by an evasion, in asserting that the *moral* conduct of the professors is everywhere exemplary. He has, it is true, some general and vague panegyrics upon the *religion* of the university and colleges; but no wise man, we should think, would consider this gentleman a competent judge in matters of faith; he surely, although his pretensions are very great on the score of intellectualism—he himself, surely cannot go the length of supposing that the school to which he belongs has any one quality which can constitute him, or any of its disciples, an authority as to what truly is, and what is not, religion. Indeed, the grounds upon which the clergy are condemned, the reasonings in favour of the university domination in this “Report,” and the general tenor of thought and sentiment pervading these works before us, prove how justly their fears and objections are entertained.

The work of M. De Lamartine is of another kind. It is a singular production; very characteristic of the highly-talented class to which he belongs, and of the times. He starts with the great principle, that the subjects of education and religion are intimately connected, and that any question concerning the one cannot be resolved without duly considering the interests of the other. He then puts the question in these words:—

“L’Eglise dit: ‘Le culte, c’est la foi; la foi, c’est l’enseignement. Vous m’avez donné le culte, vous me devez l’enseignement: rien de plus rigoureusement légitime. L’Etat dit: l’enseignement c’est l’homme; l’enseignement c’est l’esprit humain. Si je vous livre l’enseignement, je vous livre l’homme, je vous livre l’esprit humain, je vous livre la civilisation tout entière; en un mot, j’abdique. Un certain scrupule me retient encore; je veux bien vous en livrer par exemple, tout l’enseignement domestique, tout l’enseignement populaire tout l’enseignement des premières années de l’homme jusqu’à seize ans; mais laissez moi l’enseignement transcendant, l’enseignement public, l’enseignement pour ainsi dire, civil. Cela m’appartient du moins!—L’Eglise réplique: ‘Non! L’esprit est à vous; mais je réponds des Ames. Si vous ne me laissez pas examiner vos doctrines et contrôler la foi de vos professeurs, je refuse le concours, je me sépare de vous, je ne vous prête plus mon ministère dans vos collèges.’”

Now, in point of fact, neither the State nor the Church use this language. The State is not willing to give the youth of France, or the administration of education, to this extent, to the clergy. The Church does not, or we are very much mistaken, admit that the spirit or mind of man (for perhaps the latter is the truer interpretation of the phrase "*esprit humain*") belongs to the State exclusively; she claims also to have a share in its guidance. M. De Lamartine, having, however, stated in this way the question, proceeds to reason upon it, and deduce his conclusions. There is a great deal of very beautiful writing, and many things there are very true, occurring in the course of the argument, which we have not space for here, being obliged to content ourselves with the statement of what he considers to be the true difficulty, and of the remedy which he proposes. The *difficulty* is the want of liberty—liberty for all. The State oppresses the Church—the Church hampers the State. The present ecclesiastical system is repressive of the life-like expansion which is proper to man's intelligence, and of the many high thoughts and longings which are striving for expression in the hearts of the faithful—the system, both ecclesiastical and political, is bearing like a weight of lead upon the many enlightened minds to be found amongst religionists and philosophers not in communion with the Church of Rome, which are big with plans for the regeneration of society, and cannot, because of the narrow policy that obtains, bring them to the birth. The *remedy* which M. De Lamartine proposes is perfect liberty for all parties; for the legislative means by which this liberty is to be attained we must again refer to the work itself; he himself supposes that they would be effectual, and thus sums up:—

"L'Etat ayant rendu l'indépendance à l'Eglise, la liberté de culte à tous les citoyens, la liberté d'enseignement aux familles, il rétiendrait énergiquement à son tour son droit et sa liberté à lui. Il se souviendra que si l'Eglise est l'arbitre de la foi, que si le père de famille est l'arbitre de l'éducation de son enfant, il est, lui, l'Etat, l'arbitre et le tuteur de la civilisation. En laissant respectueusement la liberté légale à tout le monde, à tous les établissements religieux ou privés, la liberté d'enseignement à toutes les nuances de la foi et de la volonté des familles, il se reconnaîtra le droit et le devoir de leur faire concurrence par un vaste et puissant système d'enseignement civil, &c. Ainsi se trouvera satisfait, par la triple concurrence de l'Eglise, des établissements privés et de la puissante centralisation enseignante de l'Etat, ce que veut la religion, ce que demande la famille, et ce que demande l'Etat, cette famille souveraine qui a aussi charge d'âmes, quoi qu'on en dise, et qui répond à la postérité de la perpétuité et de l'acroissement de l'esprit humain! L'Eglise sera émancipée du gouvernement, le gouvernement émancipé de l'Eglise, la philosophie

émancipé des deux. Les âmes seront enlevées au budget et remises à leur foi et à Dieu. C'est l'état de l'Amerique, de la Belgique, et le monde voit si le sentiment religieux s'y étient dans l'air de la liberté! C'est aussi la tendance du reste de l'Europe."

Liberty! this much used and misused word! Liberty, civil and religious, like that of America, where the declaration of independence begins somewhat in this manner—"Forasmuch as Almighty God hath made all men equal!" and finds its daily comment in advertisements for the sale of negro men and women, separating husband from wife, parent from child, brother from sister, like so many cattle, or for the apprehension of runaway slaves!—where the State cannot guarantee either life or property, whenever it pleases a lawless mob, in the gratification of its base desires or fierce revenge, to assail either—where, only within the last few weeks, the wretched and unhappy leader of a blasphemous sect has been mercilessly murdered in defiance of solemn pledges given for his safety; and this, not from any feeling of righteous indignation, but from *pure malignancy*!

As for Belgium, the world must wait for the solution of the problem, of which the first steps are but now working. We do not believe it will have to wait long, or that the result will be such as the advocates of liberalism anticipate. In rising from the perusal of M. De Lamartine's "*Nostrum*," we can only wonder at the amount of intellect and want of sound judgment and common sense that sometimes go together.

For this essay, the *Univers*, the organ of the Church in France, has thanked M. De Lamartine in a very eloquent article—not as agreeing with all he says, but as grateful for his advocacy of that of which they say they have, in the present day, but the mockery—"the liberty of the Church;" which they are willing to accept on any conditions whatever, provided they be approved by Rome.

We have little to observe as regards the "Réponse à M. De Lamartine," save that the want of liberty of which he complains is therein denied, and the danger of the condition which he advocates exposed. The author of the "Reponse" declares, moreover, that the struggle between the Church and the University is one of secondary importance, to the settlement of which the Chambers are quite competent. That which is curious, however, in this *brocheur*, is the ground upon which the union between the Church and State is defended. The writer, whilst professing the greatest reverence for the former, of which he declares himself to be a faithful member, nevertheless considers, that if she were released from the wholesome restraint imposed upon her by her union with the State, she would of necessity

become unduly dominant, and, by consequence, the destroyer of all true liberty; and that therefore this union is necessary to keep *the Church out of mischief*. The inevitable tendency of the Roman Catholic Church, first to domination, and then to spiritual tyranny, is either implied or expressed by all who unite on the side of the university, or in defence of the part which the Chamber has taken; and is really, in fact, the most powerful element of opposition with which the clergy have to contend, because, both from past experience, and a right understanding of the dogmas which they believe and teach, it is too well founded. In this respect, the controversy in this country on the subject of education, and the part which belongs to the Church in its administration, is very much modified, not having this fear as a proper element in it.

We are afraid that we shall have wearied our readers with the length to which we have carried these remarks; we would only, in conclusion, point to the fact, well worthy the deep and serious attention of all thinking and religious men, how much the world at this present moment is agitated, and upon what a sea of strife and angry debates the Church especially seems to be launched! There is a perception of evil in the minds of all, and an earnest desire for its remedy; the highest intelligences are pregnant with schemes of amelioration. Regeneration is the word with which philanthropy and philosophy are girding up their energies to heal the dangerous wounds and bind together the broken elements of the social body. Every power and capacity of the mind—every better feeling of the heart are brought into exercise—every region which thought can reach—every depth which the spirit of man alone can measure, are sought into, to ascertain why it is that we have come into the condition in which we find ourselves. What is to be the cure? What the result? All are agreed that the throes of a moral parturition are upon the world; but as long as the doctrine is held, that the guidance of the spiritual rightly belongs to the State, or that “there is nothing more truly religious than liberalism, properly carried into practice” * (that is, the liberalism of the latitudinarian school), neither philosophers nor statesmen will be able to assuage her present pains, nor bring them to a happy issue.

* Such is the concluding sentence of the work by M. De Lamartine. It is either his or his editor's, for the book before us is a popular edition.

ART. III.—*Essays on Partial Derangement of the Mind in Supposed Connexion with Religion.* By the late JOHN CHEYNE, M.D., F.R.S.E., M.R.I.J., Physician-General to Her Majesty's Forces in Ireland. Dublin: Curry and Co.

THIS work contains instruction of the most valuable kind, both for the medical practitioner and the divine. We have, however, to address ourselves to the latter class only, and to point out to them the singular advantages, as we believe, which the study of it is calculated to yield them. From a limited and imperfect education, which is too seldom considerably enlarged in after life, the clergy are but little acquainted with the philosophy of our physical nature, and with the close affinity between the material and the immaterial part of man. We are too much in the habit of addressing ourselves to our task, as if the soul was something altogether to be separately dealt with—as if it were independent of the body. For, without requiring extensive physical knowledge, and still less extensive metaphysical attainments, for which but few minds are naturally formed, there is yet an amount of knowledge on these subjects within reach of most which must prove of vast assistance in enabling them to deal with the spiritual states of *others*, upon surer and more self-satisfying principles. The mind and conscience of a clergyman may, we are persuaded, often thus receive relief, when it can be made to appear that other causes are mixed up with a certain mental state, which places it out of his own immediate jurisdiction—that where his own anxious efforts have failed to produce relief, it is possible that physical aid may be called in to accomplish it. As it is not our intention to make this work a mere vehicle for conveying our own opinions—as the attitude in which we find ourselves placed by it is that of learners, and not of teachers—we shall at once proceed to direct the attention of our readers to its important contents.

The autobiographical sketch prefixed to it is more especially designed to read lessons to the “junior members of the medical profession.” Yet, as no thoughtful mind can read it without instruction, we shall not altogether pass over it.

Dr. Cheyne was born at Leith, in February, 1777. His father, who also practised medicine, is thus briefly described.—“He was a man of great cheerfulness, benevolence, good sense, and singleness of mind. He would visit the poor as promptly as the rich, and his half-crown was as freely given, to those who had no means of procuring food, as his prescription.” He succeeded his uncle, John Cheyne, a kindred spirit, who had acquired the name of “the friend of the poor.” His mother was “an am-

bitious woman, of honourable principles, constantly stimulating her children to exertion, and intently occupied with their advancement in life." We mention these particulars, because we have no doubt that the advantages of such connexions formed the solid foundations of his successful career. His early school education could have contributed little, or nothing, to it; neither under Dr. —, "who would flog a whole form till he became breathless and pale, and unable to proceed;" and who "during my whole life continued to preside over a great portion of my uneasy dreams!" Nor under that private teacher who, "with his pupil, had more relish for frivolous talk, than for Virgil and Homer." With Dr. Cheyne's future career, as a medical practitioner, we shall not meddle, excepting to point out, that entire devotedness to his profession, and to all the accomplishments appertaining to it, were the fair cause of his triumphant success. This is the true secret of success in most paths. The autobiography is dated October, 1835. It is confined almost entirely to topics interesting to members of his own profession. It is briefly continued by the editor, who commences his sketch thus:—

"The foregoing short narrative was written merely in the hope of interesting those who, in seeking to attain, in his own profession, a similar eminence with the writer, might desire to learn the means which, in his case, led to the accomplishment of that end. His having written it with this one object in view will account for his not making any mention of the growth in his mind of those religious principles which all who knew him intimately were well aware exercised complete control over his actions. He died January 31, 1836."

The following account of the support and comfort yielded to him by religion in his last moments is, we conceive, invaluable:—

"You may wish to know the condition of my mind. I am humbled to the dust by the consideration that there is not one action of my busy life which will bear the eye of a holy God. But when I reflect on the invitation of the Redeemer (Matt. ii. 28), and that I have accepted that invitation; and, moreover, that my conscience testifies that I earnestly desire to have my will in all things conformed to the will of God, I have peace—I have the promised rest—promised by Him in whom was found no guile in his mouth."

We cannot persuade ourselves to pass by without extracts the memorandum headed "Directions relative to my burial, &c." He would have no tolling of bells—an inexpensive funeral—no attempt at a funeral sermon. "I would pass away without notice from a world which, with all its pretensions, is empty. *Tinnit-inane est.*"

Tinnit-inane est! How forcibly this reminded us of the following passage in the life of a brother physician and friend, the late Sir C. Bell:—

“Whoever has sat on a sunny stone, in the midst of a stream, and played with the osier twigs and running waters, must, if he have a soul, remember that day, should he live a hundred years; and to return to such a spot, after *twenty* years of a struggling life in the great world of man’s inventions—to come back thus to nature, in her simple guise—again to look up to the same dark hill—again to the same trees, still in their youth and freshness—the same clean running waters—if he can do this, and think himself better than a cork floating in the stream, he has more conceit than I.” *Tinnit-inane est!*

Dr. Cheyne goes on to say, “Let not my family mourn for one whose trust is in Jesus. *By respectful and tender care of their mother, by mutual affection, and by irreproachable conduct,* my children will best show their regard for my memory.”

On a “rustic monument” he desired the following inscription to be engraven:—

“Reader! the name, profession, and age of him whose body lies beneath, are of little importance; but it may be of great importance to you to know that, by the grace of God, he was brought to look to the Lord Jesus, as the only Saviour of sinners, and that this ‘looking unto Jesus’ gave peace to his soul.

“Reader! pray to God that you may be instructed in the Gospel, and be assured that God will give his Holy Spirit, the only Teacher of true wisdom, to him that asks him.”

On the other side of the column were to be engraven the following texts:—From St. John iii. 16; St. Matthew xi. 28, 29, 30; Hebrews xii. 14.

These and other equally humble and pious directions were given and attended to; and, the editor adds, “the monument which marks the spot where Dr. Cheyne lies buried, besides the texts and inscription above given, bears only the initials, J. C.”

The essays, to which we now proceed, are, as the editor observes, in “a crude and unfinished state.” It appears that Dr. Cheyne was led to write them merely to disprove the allegation against Evangelical religion, that there is a tendency in it to produce a deranged state of the understanding. The positions he seeks to establish are these—

1. That mental derangements are invariably connected with bodily disorder.

2. That such derangements of the understanding, as are attended with insane speculations on the subject of religion, are generally, in the first instance, perversions of only one power of the mind.

3. That clergymen, to whom these essays are particularly addressed, have little to hope for in placing divine truth before a melancholic or hypochondriacal patient, until the bodily disease, with which the mental delusion is connected, is cured or relieved.

4. That many of the doubts and fears of truly religious persons of sane mind depend either upon ignorance of the constitution and operations of the mind, or upon disease of the body.

It cannot be denied that we are bound to listen with the utmost respect and attention to any one who is qualified to discuss such important topics as these.

The first essay, which is styled introductory, has for its motto a quotation from "Pinel on Insanity," of which this sentiment forms a text for future remarks—"It cannot be doubted that to consider the faculties of the mind separately would contribute to facilitate the study of pneumatology." The meaning of this is afterwards explained—"Whatever *unity* of essence the mind may have, it operates as though it were an *aggregate* of *distinct faculties*." Dr. Cheyne truly observes that this doctrine is assumed, not proved. Indeed, the hope of being able to prove it is absurd. Facts, or supposed facts, may cause the scales to rise and fall, between probability and improbability; and this is all we can look for. Some illustrations of Pinel's view are subjoined, such as the state of the mind when dreaming—when the *imagination* and *memory* are active, whilst other faculties are dormant; and again, from the destruction of some faculties and principles by external injury, or disease, while the mind is otherwise unimpaired.

The opposite theory to this is, that the mind is a simple substance, with varied powers and operations. To discuss these important questions is beside our purpose. It seems only right to say that Dr. Cheyne is inclined to regard the mind as an aggregate of distinct faculties, rather than as an uncompounded simple substance. Mental disorders, he observes, may arise from the following causes:—

1. From a disordered condition of the organs of sense.
2. From a disorder of one or more of the intellectual faculties.
3. From a disorder of one or more of the natural affections and desires.
4. From a disorder of one or more of the moral affections.

Eccentricity in religious people is oftentimes a stumbling-block to merely superficial observers, who, unconscious that it may proceed from disease, rashly attribute it to religion. The above classification of causes may enable the clergyman to draw satisfactory conclusions, in particular cases, which frequently

painfully oppress his mind, and so give relief to himself and to others.

The following is a remarkably simple test of unsoundness of mind :—

“If we consider a deranged faculty not to be deranged ; or if we distinguish its derangement, but are unable to control its influence, we are insane.”

It appears that moral changes of character may take place from causes with which the religious teacher has no concern ; so that “the sensualist is spiritualized, the proud man becomes humble, the ambitious man lowly.” The next remark is of much importance to students—that the activity of the mental faculties depends on supply or exhaustion of the sensorial power—*i. e.*, on the physical state of the brain. Long continued exercise of body or mind must be followed by rest, food, or sleep, as the case may be ; or the full vigour of the mental powers cannot be given to any subject. There is a warning re-echoed often enough, in vain, against the severe demands on the intellect in our Universities :—

! “In a justly-celebrated University, in which the examination requires application which is sufficient to impair the power of most minds, it has been observed that many of the fellows, after their election, have lost all their original relish for learning, and have become men of little performance, although originally of great promise.”

Another direction is well worth the notice of those who would guard against the natural consequences of approaching years. “That a mental endowment should retain its vigour, it is necessary that it be moderately exercised.” We have no doubt that the old age of the intellect is oftentimes premature. The absolute necessity for exertion has yielded to success ; the cravings of vanity for intellectual distinction have died away ; and then, too often, the inevitable consequences of disused faculties follow—premature decay.

The second essay, “on false perceptions,” is very instructive. It fairly puts ghost stories *hors de combat*. Drunkards have assured Dr. Cheyne that they have seen and heard fairies, elves, devils, and spirits, watching them, grinning at them, whispering together, and conspiring against them. What a terrible warning !

Dr. Cheyne states the *ear* to be more liable to delusion than the sight, or any other of the senses. This accounts for the fact that most of our ghost stories are founded on *noises*, rather than on sight. We recollect a case somewhat similar to that mentioned by Dr. Cheyne (p. 65). When assailed by horrible suggestions, the person we allude to would put the muzzle of

a loaded gun to his mouth, and then declare he would rather shoot himself than yield to such temptations. Dr. Cheyne well remarks on the danger of admitting demoniacal possessions as the causes of such effects as these. He affirms, he has never seen a case of disordered mind, however subtle, which could not be easily explained, upon natural principles. Whilst acknowledging the moral power of Satan, he yet justly concludes that, "as there are no rules for distinguishing between the workings of the human mind, when influenced by bodily diseases, when yielding to its unrestrained propensity to evil, and when acted upon by Satan, the extent of Satanic agency cannot be known, nor ought the mode of its operation to be assumed upon conjecture." He disproves Mede's opinion, that the demoniacs mentioned in the Gospels laboured under natural diseases, by requiring it to be proved (in reference to Matt. viii. 28, &c.) that disease is not merely a mode of animal life, but something substantive, and transferable from one class of beings to another—from man to the lower animals.

The well-known vision of Colonel Gardiner is reducible, Dr. Cheyne says, to "a disordered condition of the organs of sense;" though, with Christian philosophy, he concludes that such a case might be overruled for good, as it unquestionably was in Gardiner's.

The next essay, "on disorder of the mind confined to a single faculty," is the longest in the book, and is copiously illustrated by striking facts. It lets us into some strange mysteries of our nature, which may well teach us lessons of humility, self-denial, and trust in Providence as man's only refuge. "In consequence (Dr. Cheyne says) of excitement of the brain, or of external injuries of the head, the recollection of a language, long forgotten, has been restored; and by the same means, the knowledge of a language suddenly lost. In the latter part of his life, the — of — was insane; in his last illness, as his end approached, he perfectly recovered his senses, but with this peculiarity, that he had lost all power of speaking the English language, or any other but the Latin. He talked freely in Latin to all who were about him, and understood those who could speak to him in that tongue; and in this state he continued till he died." After mentioning some other facts of a similar character, showing that the mind sometimes retains the power of performing many of its acts in a perfect manner, whilst it is unable to perform the *most important* of all—that of connecting the present with the past and future—he deduces a further proof of his opinion, that the mental functions are separate and independent. He asks how it is that "the

mind is not broken down simultaneously—does not yield by uniform and gradual decay, as might be expected were it uncompounded, and its several faculties only varied modes of action; but that some one faculty, frequently *memory* (the one under consideration), is debilitated or destroyed before any failure is discoverable in the rest?" We could give our own explanation of this, were not such a discussion beside our professed purpose. "Complete loss of memory (our author says), productive of permanent incapacity, has often ensued from inflammation of the brain, or a portion of it; or from *over-exertion of the mind, violence of the passions, intemperance, &c.*" Here are lessons for the moral teacher which most certainly it is his duty to bring forward in aid of his exhortations to virtue, under proper circumstances. To the facts adduced we can add one well known to ourselves. The individual referred to had been a great reader of voyages and travels; and during this *change* of memory (for it could not be called *failure*), he spoke of the incidents of his former reading, as if they had actually occurred to himself; he had tickled trout in the Nile, and ridden on a crocodile. These hallucinations ended in paralysis.

Having observed that insanity is so prevalent in some families, that he has known two, three, or four children of the same parents suffer under that disorder; and, further, that in the families of a brother and two sisters there were ten cases of insanity—five in one, two in another, and three in the third family; he proceeds to add this strong opinion: "We have no doubt that various immoral and vicious practices ought to be ascribed to insanity. When periodic insanity has shown itself in a large family, it is probable that some members of the family will evince a propensity to thieving or swindling; and when more than one child of the same parents, bursting through all the restraints imposed by carefully-instilled principles and established habits, engage in swindling transactions, it will often appear, upon enquiry, that insanity has previously broken out in that family." As before, Dr. Cheyne adds his facts. He knew a large family in which there was a great diversity of character, connected with an inherited tendency to mental derangement: "one has been guilty of various incongruities of character; one is an incorrigible liar; one a dexterous swindler; and two have been in a lunatic asylum. Falsehood and swindling, in such individuals, are but symptoms of mental derangement."

After some further facts and discussions, Dr. Cheyne asks the reader to admit that he has established this point—and we think he has—"that the imagination may be insane, while

the other faculties, were they not acted upon by it, would be in a natural state." It is, in fact, "the disorder of a single faculty," which the essay professes to examine into.

We pass by, for want of space, some interesting matter, in which he proves what "havoc may be produced by a single faculty being destroyed, while the intellect, in other respects, remains inviolate." The affection alluded to is an interruption to the power of expressing thought, even when the mind is, in other respects, unimpaired. "The power over language (he remarks) is often wonderfully enlarged in the commencement of intoxication, and in *some maniacal paroxysms*, from excitement of the brain." One effect which the perusal of this work has produced upon us is to deepen our horror at intoxication; and we have, therefore, quoted the above to show how near akin it may be to real madness.

"Weeping (Dr. Cheyne beautifully observes) is as much the language of grief as speech is of thought." And Wordsworth says—

—— "The fountain-head of tears—

"His own peculiar utterance for distress."

"Tears (Dr. Cheyne continues) have been interrupted by a severe injury done to one of the affections, as effectually as words by the destruction of one of the faculties of the mind. How ready are those who are under a stunning bereavement to declare, when the wound of their heart is fresh, that they cannot shed a single tear." How often have we, in passing through the vale of TEARS, heard the following lament:—"Oh that I could only cry—I feel as if it would so relieve me. There seems nothing natural in my grief. I, who wept so bitterly for my father, have not a single tear to shed for my child." Again: "Ever since my husband, or son, or daughter died, my affections have been frozen and my eyes dried up." He adds, "When the first bitterness of grief is past, tears will again begin to flow." Our own experience of life's sadnesses has taught us the inestimable advantage, to the professional comforter, of being master of such phenomena as these. A friend of ours, whose tears had long refused to flow, found the blessed boon when kneeling at the Lord's table.

Dr. Cheyne gives this advice, having previously shown the truth of it:—"It is always desirable that tears should come to the relief of the deeply afflicted; and it is wiser to allow the first gush of grief to be over, before we attempt, by religious consideration, to moderate its poignancy." It is well that henceforth we can be guided, not only by good taste, but by philosophy, in avoiding to violate the sanctity of first passionate grief. We

leave the questionable opinions of page 110 to the editor's judicious note.

Dugald Stewart would be satisfied with reducing the following passage to his favourite theory of association:—

"A lively impression made upon one of the senses, for example, by a favourite scene not viewed for many years; the chime of the village bells, after one has been long accustomed to the 'dusky lane and wrangling mart;' or even the breeze which has passed over a sweet-briar hedge, will at once call up ideas and slumbering feelings, invested with much of the freshness of youth."

Dr. Cheyne gives the above as an example of this philosophy:

"That one faculty may be affected by the condition of another, or of a group of faculties, is shown by the different conditions of the memory and imagination, under different degrees of mental excitement, partial and general. Names or facts, which cannot be called to mind when the reasoning faculties are in active exercise, will often be recollected when they are less active; and *vice versa*."

This is only one instance in which, as we imagine, this quiet but profound thinker will disturb some of the older metaphysics.

The next essay is "on a disordered state of the affections." It is shorter and less copiously illustrated; but there is enough in it to show the Christian teacher that, in proper cases, he may combat "inordinate affection," not only on the ground of certain danger to the soul, but to the ultimate sanity of the mind. We conceive this is a subject admitting of the strongest appeals for self-control, from hints only of the bare possibility of final consequences to the intellect.

The conflicts of romantic love, Dr. Cheyne remarks, have often ended in what is called *erotomania*. We find ourselves called upon to warn our fair readers "against sanguine lovers, who frequently become jilts." The reason is this: "the fire, from its intensity, soon burns out—a fate to which all passionate affections are liable." Again (and how important is the *moral*!)—"Love may be extinguished in various ways, chiefly through a discovery of a degradation, real or supposed, of the object of attachment: nay, degradation, effected even by the lover himself, will produce not merely indifference, but disgust, as in the case of the brutish Amnon." We must remind our readers that all this is not mere common-place remarks or conjecture. Dr. Cheyne is discussing the fundamental principles of our nature. He is proving, and not guessing. The following is a painful instance of a disordered affection, which one rejoices to know cannot be criminal in the eyes of the Heart-searcher:—"Some who have been attached parents have lost all regard for their

children, and, conscious of the change, have acknowledged and bewailed a want of affection which they have ignorantly viewed as criminal." We should not have thought this parental affection was more liable to extinction in women than in men; yet such appears to be the fact, though Dr. Cheyne observes, that this cruel maternal change will be found to depend upon bodily disease. Again—"The cupidity of misers and collectors may end in a state of derangement, which is generally incurable." And lastly—"When any of the desires are inordinately engaged, as we learn from the great Physician, there is but one method of cure—namely, excision of the object of desire, even if it be as precious as the right eye, or right hand." This is the infallibility of Christian teaching, and Dr. Cheyne does just homage to it. There is no cure, for example, for drunkenness, as we believe, but teetotalism—that is, complete excision of the otherwise hopelessly refractory right hand or right eye. It is both spiritual and physical philosophy.

"We now approach (says Dr. Cheyne, Essay V.) the chief object of this work, and proceed to enquire into those disordered states of the mind which are connected, or supposed to be connected, with religion." We have read no part of the work with more satisfaction and conviction than this. It is sober, scriptural, philosophical, convincing, and has for ever stopped the convenient cry against religion, which (Dr. Cheyne says) is as old as the days of Porcius Festus. He thus, in general terms, states and argues the question:—

"That mental derangement may originate in superstition or fanaticism—by either of which, behind a visor of religious zeal, all sobriety of mind is invaded, to the interruption of social and domestic duties—will be understood by those who know that insanity, in the *predisposed*, may arise from any excess which excites, at the same time that it agitates the mind. But that true religion, which removes doubts and distractions, explains our duties, and reconciles us to them, and teaches that all things work together for good to them that love God, and thus not only guides but comforts us, as we toil through the weary maze of life—which, in every pursuit, demands moderation and method, and calms every rising storm of the passions—that true religion should be productive of insanity is not easily credible, and would require the clearest evidence."

Further on, in the same general way, he says:—

"We firmly believe that the Gospel, received simply, never, since it was first preached, produced a single case of insanity: the admission that it has such a tendency ought never to have been made to the enemies of the cross. We grant that fanaticism and superstition have caused insanity, as well they may; but by the Gospel—by a knowledge of and trust in Jesus—NEVER."

This, granting only the divinity of our religion, *ought* to be admitted by our common sense.

The French physicians have noticed that, before the revolution, a large proportion of the insane of France were *monks*. But this, as Dr. Cheyne observes, is an argument against superstition, and not religion; and he adds—

“It would be equally unfair to conclude that we are to trace insanity to true religion, because evidences of *monomania* are to be discovered among fanatics at home, who have mistaken unequivocal symptoms of hysterics, or the inarticulate growlings of enthusiasm, for manifestations of the Holy Spirit.”

The author mentions the case of a lady whose religious sincerity was never doubted until she began to manifest extraordinary aberrations in her conduct, when all was at once settled by the summary formula of religious madness! Whereas, Dr. Cheyne says, the explanation of the case is obvious:—

“In consequence of bodily disease—of one of those irregularities of circulation which takes place at critical periods of life—the brain became affected, and the mind suffered in consequence. The sentiment of vanity (the peculiar form under which the aberrations appeared), naturally strong, but for a long time suppressed, became ungovernable, and swept away every trace of religious feeling. If any principle could have withstood the extreme activity of this sentiment, it was religion, which, it proved the greatest comfort to a very sensible and attached family to know, had once been the rule of this lady’s life.”

The following is too remarkable, and too charitably and wisely discussed, to allow of our passing over it, though we are aware it may be read by unkind minds:—

“A friend of ours was one day riding with a clergyman of refined manners, who, for a good many years, had been devoted to the service of God. To the amazement of our friend, his companion, without any adequate provocation, fell into a paroxysm of ungovernable fury, swearing at a wood-ranger, and threatening him with vengeance, because he had been dilatory in obeying an order which he had received relative to a matter of little importance.”

This painful phenomenon is thus, with singular charity and (as we believe) sound philosophy, commented on and explained:

“Had this fact become public (says Dr. Cheyne), all the devotedness of his profession, for which this excellent clergyman was distinguished, would have been considered as assumed; and his habitual humility of demeanour, arising from a sense of his own unworthiness, as the result of hypocrisy. Such things must be expected—such is a part of the hardness that must be endured by the good soldier of the cross. We cannot doubt that this was a monomaniacal explosion, in which aristocratic pride, much fostered during the youth of this member of a

noble family, was roused by cerebral excitement, and for a time resumed its original ascendancy. We come to this conclusion upon the following considerations—first, this gentleman had, shortly before, undertaken a duty which led to over-excitement of the brain; secondly, he appeared quite unconscious of the incongruity of his conduct—an unconsciousness which is one of the usual attendants upon insanity; and, lastly, his only brother died in a mad-house.”

We know not which to admire most in this explanation—its wisdom, or its Christian charity. The Doctor proceeds to another fact:—“A widow lady, who possessed considerable natural ability and a cultivated understanding, and was devoted to religion, but devoid of prudence, engaged in a speculation which required considerable capital.” With a master’s hand, Dr. Cheyne sketches the terrible struggle of the failing schemes of the wild speculation with high principle. The sad end of this lady is thus told—“She went shortly afterwards to the house of a friend in the country, and proclaimed the Millennium, which she said had begun that day. She has ever since been in confinement.”

The following admirable maxims are deduced by Dr. Cheyne from the above history, and we strongly recommend them to many sincere, but ardent Christians:—

“No event in life ought to become a subject of prayer until it has received the sanction not only of the conscience, but of the understanding also. When a matter is doubtful, we may pray to have our understanding enlightened; but when it bears the stamp of imprudence, we are not to pray for leadings or openings of Providence, to show that we ought to set about it.”

How many have wrecked every earthly joy through errors of judgment thus pointed out! Dr. Cheyne “trusts that none hereafter will consider the terms ‘religious insanity,’ and ‘insanity in a religious person,’ as convertible.” This is probably the true answer to the insult upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ perpetrated, in returns from establishments for the insane, by men who, if we charitably hope they may not be without religion, are yet without true philosophy, when they coolly describe whole classes of cases under the head of “insanity from religion.”

There is an admission, however, which Dr. Cheyne makes, that insanity may appear in truly religious men:—

“True religion (he says) is a preservative, although by no means a complete preservative, against derangement of the mind. We have no intention of concealing that we have known many instances of insanity amongst believers; but it was not caused by their creed. We have also known instances in which all sense of religion has been permanently destroyed by insanity. Of such cases we would remark, that the believer has no right to expect for his believing friend exemp-

tion from evils arising from the state of the body, *on which insanity always depends*. Let him, moreover, recollect, that as total insanity puts an end to moral accountability, nothing which may take place during a paroxysm of that disorder can affect the future happiness of his friend."

But we must hurry on. The next essay, "on the constitution of man—upright, fallen, and regenerate"—must be studied to be understood. The opening paragraph will show its importance :—

"By acquiring a just view of the *present constitution* of man, we must learn that his obedience to God will, of necessity, be imperfect, by the infirmity of his nature ; even the mature Christian cannot always stand upright ; all that he can hope for is, that his desire to serve God, proceeding from a right principle, shall be earnest and sincere."

We extract a few occasional thoughts, in the hope they may lead the reader to examine the whole for himself :—

"Godliness is a positive principle—ungodliness, being a negative term, might therefore be used to denote merely the absence of godliness : as cold is merely the absence of the matter of heat.

"Ungodliness and sin are commonly taken to be synonymous, because it is the want of godliness that tends to sin.

"When, in Scripture, it is said, 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,' the expression must not be taken as proving that original sin is an essential attribute, forming a new and *positive* element in the nature of every descendant of Adam."

The following remark is most important :—

"It is well known that the physical nature of man depends upon the food with which he is supplied. It is not, however, generally known, how much man's moral depends upon his physical nature."

This again arrested our attention :—

"It seems that the mind can now perceive and think only by means of the bodily organs ; compress the nerves which convey sensation, and all perception of the qualities of bodies will be interrupted ; compress the brain, and thought will be suspended ; compress the nerves of motion, and the mandates of the will can no longer be executed.

"Every fresh inroad which is made on the mind—every instance of *amentia*, *delirium*, or insanity—is connected with superadded disease of the body. We never saw a case of mental derangement, even where it was traceable to a moral cause, in which there was not reason to believe that bodily disease could have been detected before the earliest aberration, had an opportunity of examination offered."

Again, that lessons of caution are read to us by this declaration :—

"Not only does every deranged state of the *intellectual* faculties and

the *natural affections* depend upon *bodily disease*, but derangements of the *religious* and *moral* sentiments also originate in disease of the body.

"As we are ignorant of the *nature* of the mind, so are we ignorant of the *nature* of the affections and passions, unless they concur with certain bodily phenomena, and influence the expression and conduct.

"It is observable that many of the same animal feelings which belong to the passions are also producible by causes merely physical. The sinking of despair is not more absolute than the hopelessness which depends purely upon disease of the nervous system."

A good example illustrates this. The following is, indeed, a melancholy view of man's degraded condition :—

"From the soul becoming the minister of the body, in consequence of the ascendancy of the carnal principle, many evil practices have arisen which have still further impaired the physical constitution of individuals and families, and thereby further degraded their minds. For example, to preserve domestic purity, intermarriages between near relatives are prohibited. When the divine law in this respect is broken, a degenerate offspring, as in the case of the Bourbons, may be expected. Even from the marriage of first cousins inveterate forms of scrofula are sometimes generated, and a liability to insanity. Various diseases, originating in sensuality, descend in families. A vicious habit of intemperance will excite in children, procreated after the habit is established, a propensity to the same habit, which has descended to the third generation."

Surely this may solve some of the enigmas of society :—

"Perfection, as preached by that great and useful man, Mr. Wesley, at the beginning of his ministry, is unattainable by any *imperfect* being, and will belong to man only when he is perfected by the union of a spiritual body to a soul which will clearly reflect the image of God."

With the "Essay on Conscience" we must deal in the same way, in the hope that our extracts may lead to a calm examination of all the opinions brought forward and discussed :—

"That there is within us a standard of right and wrong, no one who has attended to the operations of his own mind will deny. This is the *natural* conscience.

"The conscience, like every other mental endowment, is improved by being properly exercised. By this means habitual rectitude of conduct is established.

"With every renewed indulgence, the ability of resisting temptation is weakened. This is felt by those who frequent the gaming-table, the cock-pit, or the ring—who indulge in the use of ardent spirits, opium, tobacco, and other narcotics, which become irresistibly attractive, partly from habit, and partly from the loss of mental energy, caused by their *acting injuriously on the nervous system*. In the drunkard, not merely is the criminal propensity to the use of liquor confirmed by every repeated act of intoxication, but the whole mind becomes weak; judgment, as well as conscience, is rendered inactive,

"It is matter of daily observation, that men, originally true and honest, become false and knavish through habits of intemperance, and at last have their consciences destroyed, as if seared with a hot iron.

"That the conscience is more or less active, according to the *state of the body*, we can have no doubt. When the body is exhausted by pain or sickness, or even fatigue, the conscience becomes less sensitive ; in that half-dreamy state which often precedes sleep, especially after great fatigue, trains of thought or lines of conduct are allowed to pass through the mind in review, which would at once be dismissed were the body in vigour and the conscience on the alert."

How important to the Christian teacher to understand this infirmity, that he may arm his people against it !

In p. 180, Dr. Cheyne points out the means for distinguishing between a sound and an unsound state of the conscience, both enlightened and natural. But we must hurry to the close :—

"We have little prospect of conquering feelings of remorse, depending on bodily disease, unless we first cure the disease which maintains them."

Dr. Cheyne elsewhere points out that Cowper was once restored to sanity by Dr. Cotton.

The three next essays, "on Faith, Charity, and Hope," we can but glance at, though they are well deserving of careful reading. They are included in his system for this reason :—

"While religion requires the active exercise of the intellectual faculties, and governs all the affections, we are led to look for its chief seat in the conscience, and in the sentiments of faith, charity, and hope ; and religious madness (so called) is generally to be ascribed to one or more of these endowments."

It is only fair to confess our opinion, that the theological acumen of these essays is altogether of a high order, though it does not suit our purpose to examine its peculiarities. We therefore proceed, as before, to catch a thought here and there.

"True faith necessarily produces genuine love to God, love to the people of God, obedience to the law of God, and it generally produces hope of eternal blessedness.

"Diseases of the body, consequent *delusions* of the organs of the senses received as truths, often give faith an excitement productive of fanaticism. Thus individuals may be led to suppose that they have been visited by the Saviour, endowed with the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit," &c.

How this view should soften down religious asperities !

Dr. Cheyne puts upon the true footing, we have no doubt, the miracles of Prince Hohenloe, which Bishop Doyle said were

published for "the comfort and support of an injured, vilified, and oppressed people."

"Genuine faith is sometimes inactive in bodily diseases ; for example, in the commencement of a *sick headache*, the individual appears to be without faith, and incapable of devotional feeling."

We would just throw out a hint here, which is capable of much enlargement, as applicable to this work. Are not sick headaches the *direct* result of over-eating? If so, the Christian has another argument for temperance.

Of hope, Dr. Cheyne says—

"No sentiment more frequently influences, or is influenced by, the state of the health, than hope. We have known many, who in health were hopeful, desponding under disease. Depression of spirits will soon injure digestion. Indigestion, from physical causes, will produce despondency, even when there is no moral cause to account for the destruction of hope.

"Moods of melancholy, of which the chief characteristic is hopelessness, are produced in some nervous females by changes of weather, so that they are unerring barometers."

The following is very sad :—

"These sufferers, who often meet with but little sympathy, are erroneously supposed to be yielding to caprice, when perhaps they are in a state of great distress, without natural affection, objects of self-reproach, perhaps feeling deserted of God, left without spiritual aid in their struggles with pride, or unfounded jealousy. Those unhappy moods of the mind have destroyed the love of relatives and friends, who, had they understood the true cause of such perverted feeling, would have had their attachments to the sufferer strengthened by generous pity. We have reason to believe, that by such a state of uncertainty of feeling, sad inroads upon conjugal happiness have been made. When hope is altogether inactive, the imagination is often in a state of inordinate activity ; and thus there is a power, not only of magnifying the real evils of life, but of creating unreal evils."

The last essay is "on the presence and absence of devotional feeling." Here Dr. Cheyne remarks—

"It is necessary to remember, that much of the enjoyment which is derived from the exercises of religion depends on the temperature of the mind and upon the association of the feelings."

In his philosophy, therefore, the cathedral, and its services and pomps, are taste, and not religion. For he adds—"Let it never be forgotten, that it is not a lofty and sublimated imagination, and natural and cultivated taste, but a broken heart and a contrite spirit, that constitute the acceptable worshipper of God."

There is one important point connected with religious feelings which we are thankful to see put on the right footing, as, though we could not prove our opinion, we have long suspected the soundness of the practice; we allude to religious diaries. The following extract is from a nameless one:—"Much sweetness of prayer this morning. In the afternoon, was sunk and depressed; seemed a poor, miserable, useless wretch." Dr. Cheyne satisfactorily proves that this is physical, and needs not be Christian, experience. He hopes, in which we heartily unite, that such things will not be repeated in future publications. But we must stop, though we would gladly have said more.

Upon the whole, we think this work cannot be without good effects. In our own particular estimation, it surpasses all recent works in importance and instruction. It can hardly be without consequences to the science of metaphysics—it has, at least, improved our own. It proves the inestimable importance of cultivating the health of the body, and thus attacks the destructive luxuries of the day. We see now the value of the direction of the catechism, that we should "keep our bodies in temperance, soberness, and chastity." We say nothing about the author's peculiar views of religion; at all events, he is thoroughly sincere. We remark, too, that there is nothing like *effort* in the book: it shows the hand of a thorough master—no hard words, and no professional mystification: it is easy reading.

ART. IV.—*Vie De Rancé*. Par MONSIEUR LE VICOMTE DE CHATEAUBRIAND. Paris: H. L. Delloye, Editeur. 1844.

ON the 9th of January, 1626, a second son was born to the almost ducal house of Bouthilier de Rancé; and in the month of May, in the following year, the infant heir of many honours was held at the baptismal font by the Cardinal de Richelieu and the Marchioness d'Effiat, whose son the same cardinal very soon after judicially murdered. The young Bouthilier with his godfather's patronage received also his godfather's Christian names; and Armand Jean, the founder of La Trappe, subsequently achieved a greatness of a different complexion indeed, but scarcely inferior to that of the elder Armand Jean, the sovereign of the sovereign of France, and the assassin of her best nobility. The death of the elder brother of de Rancé opened to the latter the inheritance both of family and ecclesiastical titles; and before he could walk he was already *abbé-commendataire* of La Trappe. He was as precocious as young Cyrus; ere he

had well assumed the dress of boyhood, he puzzled the king's confessor by his acquaintance with Homer in the original Greek; and at the early age of twelve he gave to the world an edition of "Anacreon," with editorial commentaries, for which the learned world returned him empty praise, and his godfather a valuable piece of church preferment.* He several times, during his childhood, escaped narrowly from death; at four years of age he almost sank under an attack of dropsy; at fourteen he had well nigh been cut down by the then dreaded small-pox, and on various other occasions his wild and reckless daring on horseback exposed him to perils certainly fatal, and narrowly escaped. He was nursed in the lap of the great and unfortunate victim of Richelieu's enmity—the Queen Marie de Medicis, from whom he derived titles as playthings. One fortunate day saw him Canon of Notre Dame de Paris, as well as Abbé de la Trappe; the priory of Boulogne, near Chambor, was flung to him to quiet his childish importunities; two abbeys were conferred upon him, like toys, for good behaviour; and other priories, and not less valuable archdeaconries, were tossed to him for the mere trouble of asking. He had the care of hundreds of thousands of souls before he rightly understood the possession and the responsibilities of his own.

As he grew towards manhood he undertook a few of its entailed duties; he preached occasionally in his quality of priest; but his heart was surrendered to the enjoyment of the wildest delights which were placed within his reach, from his social position as a noble. The society of his day monopolized the vices of all ages; and into the abyss the young priest flung himself, without any other care or thought but that of acquiring reputation by excelling in dissipation. The sole quality of the men of his day was courage; they were everything but honest, honourable, dignified, or respectable. The women of his day were remarkable for their beauty, their amiability, and their murderous wit; they wanted nothing but the virtues of chastity and truth to make them the fair things they only seemed. In the circles of his time, if de Rancé preserved the superiority of his judgment, he made shipwreck of his morals; he became a duellist, and such a character, in the age in which he bore it, implies that he became a demon also. It was then that we find this glittering priest the most renowned *dissipateur*, the most exquisite *fat*, among the most foolish and vicious of his day; he appears to have acknowledged no serious worship, but the sad frivolities which he offered to

* Campbell's translation of "The Clouds" of Aristophanes was made at the same age, and published by a twopenny subscription of his schoolfellows.

“Les belles Montbazons, les Chatillons brillantes,
Les piquantes Bouillons, les Nemours si touchantes.”

With Madame de Rambouillet, and her powdered and perfumed pedants, he talked euphuistic nonsense; to the more wicked Montausier he made disgraceful worship. He shared in the bloody braggadocio of Condé; jested with the young actor and author, Moliere; flirted with Mademoiselle de Nemours; had what was called a *grande passion* for a crowd of sylph-like sinners; and precisely because he had no character of his own, was he selected to unite two people in marriage who were equally poor in any similar property that was at least worth anything; no respectable ecclesiastic would do the work which the laws would not sanction; and the hunting, fighting, love-making, drinking abbé is said to have performed the ceremony of marriage between *le grand monarque* and the widow of a mountebank; upon which, however, we must be allowed to remark, for our own sakes, that if that very obstinate witness called “chronology” does not, yet circumstances seem to give a testimony adverse to the deposition of M. de Chateaubriand.

De Rancé passed through the murders and mockeries, the mingled vices and virtues, the ferocity and frivolity, the dancing and destruction of the Fronde; and when that terrible and comic drama had closed, and Paris in particular afforded no more of frightful horrors for him and his companions to make epigrams upon, he retired to his splendid estate at Veretz, where, at the head of a society, of which he was the worthy chief, he spent his time in the invention of pleasures, giving brilliant *fêtes* and sumptuous festivals, and dreaming of delights that defied realization. Among other mad things, he resolved, with three young gentlemen of his own age, to undertake a wandering expedition, after the fashion of the errant Knights of the Round Table. The four embryo cavaliers furnished a common purse, and laid out a plan for “running adventures,” as it was called; but luckily for themselves, and not less so for certain dames and damosels of France, whom these self-dubbed knights would not have condescended to respect, the affair ended with its projection, and de Rancé, from a wandering knight, became a fixed astrologer. He drew instructions from the stars concerning his future conduct; and emulating the knowledge of the ancient observers of sidereal revolutions, he was acquainted with every hill in the moon, while he was yet profoundly ignorant of the mountains of the earth. His most favourite studies at this period were stars and birds; he pursued the former with his telescope, and brought down the latter with his fowling-piece. But though an excellent shot himself, he occasionally fell in with those who

were not equally dexterous. Once we read of his receiving the charge of an unskilful sportsman against the steel chain of his gaming-bag; and at other times we find him routing bands of lawless pursuers of the young priest's pheasants, falling on them as though they had been highway plunderers, rather than gentlemen as good as himself.

De Rancé obtained full orders in 1651; and here M. de Chateaubriand, in noticing his elevation to the priesthood, breaks out into what is meant for very fine writing, while he details the feelings and the consciousness of responsibility which he thinks now, for the first time, seizes the hero of his story:—

“L'imposition des mains (says he) etant faite; il ne restait plus qu' une cérémonie redoutable. J'ai entendu au pied des Alpes Vénitiennes, carillonne la nuit en l'honneur d'un pauvre lévite qui devait dire sa première messe le lendemain. Pour Rancé les ornements et les vêtements préparés à la lumière du jour, étaient magnifiques; mais soit qu'il fut saisi des terreurs du ciel, soit qu'il regardât comme des licences sacrilèges celles qu'il avait obtenues, soit qu'il ressentit cette épouvante qui saisissait un trop jeun coupable quand la Rome païenne lui delivrait des dispenses d'âge pour mourir, Rancé s'alla cacher aux Chartreux. Dieu seul le vit à l'autel. Le futur habitant du désert consacré sur la Montagne, à l'orient de Jérusalem, les prémices de la solitude.”

It is difficult to separate M. de Chateaubriand's hyperbolisms from the simple truth, but we suppose all that is intended to be conveyed here is, that the newly-ordained priest celebrated his first mass in solitude. If, however, any admiration be excited by his modesty and scrupulousness, it is not permitted to enjoy a very prolonged existence; for we find, in the next page to that recording these virtues, that shortly after his ordination he proudly refused the bishopric of Léon, for the sole reasons that its revenues were not worth his acceptance, and that its locality in Brittany was at too great a distance from the magic circle of the court. He esteemed at a much less value the honours to be gained so remote from the fountain-head of pleasure, than he did the reputation to be acquired from his dexterity in bringing down birds and supporting theses. He hunted, preached, and disputed with the energy of a giant; his greatest pride was to defeat a fencing-master with his own foils, and his greatest annoyance was to have to say mass. He walked abroad, at this period, a perfect *muscadin*, attired in a tight fitting dress of violet, made of the most precious materials; his cuffs were buttoned by emeralds, his fingers glittered with diamonds, and his hair hung in long curls down his back. When mounted, he carried a sword at his side and pistols in his holsters. His dress

was then a fawn-coloured suit, and his black taffeta cravat was edged with an embroidery of gold. His most partial biographers confess that there was nothing of the priest about him; and he thought it a great condescension if he donned a black velvet costume, with buttons of gold, when he expected serious company. The mingled web of his character was well illustrated by himself when he answered to a question of Champvallon as to where he had been, and whither he was going, that he had been preaching during the morning like an angel, and that in the afternoon he was going to hunt like the devil.

From folly to vice, from vice to heavier crimes, is the usual course of men given up to pleasure, and engaged in unlawful pursuits, as de Rancé was. Nor did he form any exception to the general rule; and the climax of his own errors is to be found in the illicit and scarcely veiled intercourse which he carried on with the young wife, and subsequently widow, of the aged libertine, the Duc de Montbazon. In the duke's house he lived as though he were one of the family, and he rewarded the hospitality and the confidence of his disreputable host by seducing his wife—a circumstance not only facile of accomplishment, but, such was the condition of the society of that day, one also that he was probably expected to achieve. One of his priestly biographers attempts to palliate this connection, by describing it as a platonic attachment, fostered by the gratitude of the brilliant duchess for important services rendered to her by de Rancé. If it went beyond the strict boundary of mere friendship, he is inclined to think that it may almost be excused, for the outward decency that was observed, and that the parties so arranged their conduct in presence of the world as to make it appear “*que l'esprit avait plus de part à cette amitié que la chair.*”

All that an extravagant mind could devise; all that unlimited means could purchase; all that taste could invent and satiated dispositions enjoy—pleasures, fêtes, banquets; the excitements of gambling, and the duel; the most brilliant equipages; the most costly attire—all these, with the young and beautiful duchess surpassing them all, were, during ten rapidly revolving years, at the entire command of the tinselled libertine. His ambition stalked forth in a double guise. It urged him to be the greatest debauchee of his day, and to rise to the highest offices in the Church. It impelled him to edit a Greek edition of Eusebius, and to give men examples of ultra-licentiousness. It made him grand almoner to the Duke of Orleans, and the adulterous lover of the Duchess of Montbazon; and at thirty years of age, de Rancé still contentedly and thoughtlessly lived on in an atmosphere polluted by folly, crime, and raging insanity.

Such was the god-son of the cardinal minister during his early years. But suddenly an event occurred which worked a remarkable change in the character and pursuits of him who had hitherto been distinguished for the possession of great talent, and who had won a bad reputation for the ingenuity with which he abused it; some of the friends of his tempestuous youth died; some incurred the displeasure of the court, fell from their high estate, and lived. De Rancé deplored these events, but found consolation for them in the society of the guilty duchess. At length, even this fair obstacle which stood between himself and his better destiny, was, as suddenly as unexpectedly, snatched away from him by a fatal attack of measles.* The reed upon which he had so long depended broke and left him without support. His despair drove him to the very verge of insanity; he buried himself in the depths of his native forest, and wandered along the banks of his native river, screaming forth the name of the lost one; he invoked the moon to restore what the Almighty had taken away; and he had recourse to unhallowed rites and ceremonies in the mad and blasphemous attempt to render again to life her who had been so awfully summoned before the judgment-seat of the Eternal. He defied heaven to keep from him what sorcery might enable him to recover, and he only ceased from wrestling with a Power which was graciously pleased to spare him, by a frightful vision which he had (as he was one day wandering in the vicinity of his *chateau*) of his house surrounded by flames. As he approached to witness the calamity, the flames appeared to retire from the building, and change into a lake of liquid fire. From the centre of this lake arose the form of a female; she seemed to be enduring the tortures of the condemned. De Rancé gazed for a moment, and then fled in the wildest affright; he rushed, despairing and distracted, into his house, where, on arriving, he sunk prostrate alike in sense and the power of speech. But these convulsions of the soul were followed by a calm, which left the sufferer in

* The well-known story of de Rancé returning after a long absence, and finding the duchess lying dead in her coffin; with the after episode of his cutting her head from her body, and employing it as a *memento* in his meditations, are matters which the author skillfully contrives to leave completely shrouded in mystery. As far as he is intelligible, we are inclined to believe that he has no faith in the first part of the legend, yet finds it too full of the elements of poetry not to wish it were true; and that he discredits the second portion, yet deems it deserving of belief because of its pictorial romance. In short, he wishes the whole legend were true, is sorry it is not so, and yet finds the entire tradition so exquisite, that he would have the world know it to be a fiction, and receive it as if it were fact.

the possession of an energy which is the parent of vigorous resolution.

The conversion of de Rancé had commenced; but we are not at all inclined to allow that it was either begun or continued under healthy influences. In our judgment of this matter, we are guided solely by the *public* acts of the so-called convert, and these, we think, authorize us in the conclusion at which we arrive. We hear of no open acknowledgment of guilt—we are told of no recourse made to the guides appointed by his Church; but we find him resorting to a cast-off mistress of the Duke of Orleans, who, having outlived the liking of the capricious Gaston, had entered a nunnery, and was now only known by the appellation of *Mother Louisa*. The result of the conversations held with this exemplary person was, that de Rancé dismantled his house, stripped his furniture of its gold trappings and his walls of their gorgeous adornments, and allowed his garden to run to seed, and to become a wilderness of weeds and rankness. There was surely not much of a right and healthy feeling exhibited in such conduct as this, though some portion of it may be accounted for. Nor do we see more to admire in the subsequent act of his receiving a few of his associates into his melancholy abode, that was not on *that* account the house of mourning where the fool might learn wisdom. We cannot, with all the willing and ready charity possible—we cannot, we say, be edified at witnessing a society of men who *began to play at penitence* before they practised it. However this may be, their leader found neither rest nor satisfaction in endeavouring to reconcile himself with Heaven after the theatrical fashion which he appears to have adopted. His ecclesiastical superiors counselled him to go as a missionary to India; they thought his wild energy and his incipient fanaticism would find a fitting sphere for development among the frowning rocks of the Himalaya. But France had more attractions for the yet unstable convert; and we find him receiving the last breath of the contemptible Gaston, carrying the feeble heart of the deceased prince to the Jesuits of Blois, writing some sensible remarks on the death of his patron, and finally, so much the fashion in his new character, that no one could die happy but with *him* by their side. It would seem that the greater portion of the Parisian world hoped to gain immortality through the merits of Armand Jean Bouthilier.

Shortly after the death of Gaston of Orleans, an event which gave great concern to de Rancé, we find the latter among the Pyrenees, whither he had resorted for the sake of consulting the

Bishop of Comminges. And here again we have an illustration of the chameleon-coloured character of the unsteady priest. He was as yet the slave of impulse—not the willing obeyer of conviction; and the new impulse, now strong upon him, he derived from the grandeur of the scenery which surrounded him as he meditated alone, or walked with the prelate. His thoughts were now intent on becoming a hermit; he would found a cell among those gloomy but majestic defiles; live upon herbs and water; forget the world; and serve the Lord in solitude. He revealed his designs to the Bishops of Comminges and Aleth, but declined following their advice. The former dignitary exposed to him the selfishness of his project; while the latter warned him that the inclinations which now impelled him were not always derived from God—that they frequently arose through mere distaste for the world—and that this very distaste was not often the offspring of the purest of motives.

For six long years did de Rancé continue to manifest his want of decision. He had, it is true, to struggle against the opposition of his relations, friends, and servants; but this opposition was at length surmounted, or totally disregarded; and he proceeded to the realization of his plans by selling his estates, and giving the produce of the sale to religious houses. Thus he commenced his career of virtue by defrauding his heirs; or, allowing him the quality of sincerity, we will amend our phrase, and say that he only deprived himself. But under what a mistaken and parti-coloured sincerity did this man work! He sold his estates at Veretz, for instance, to one of his own relatives, who was probably anxious to retain the patrimonial soil in the possession of the family; but the purchase-money was not forthcoming at the required moment; de Rancé immediately pronounced the bargain void, and for a hundred thousand crowns made the entire estate over to the Abbé D'Effiat, the *favourite* (to use a no more significant term) of the royal courtesan, Ninon de l'Enclos!!

We have already intimated that de Rancé, when a child, was made *Abbé Commendataire* of La Trappe. A *commendataire* implied a person who held a *commendé*, and the latter term signified a title to a regular benefice, for the enjoyment of its profits, without the performance of its duties. De Rancé declared himself conscious of the guilt of holding such a preferment, but at the same time he pronounced as strongly his utter scorn of becoming a *frocard*. He would be a regular priest, but not a regular hard-working priest; and was willing to perform duties, provided only that he was permitted to fulfil them after a will and fashion of his own. With seeming contradiction he

now resigned every regular benefice of which he was possessed, retaining only that of La Trappe, to which he had been very irregularly appointed. Of this, however, he became, with some difficulty, the regular Abbé, and, on his institution, received the episcopal benediction at the hands of the Irish (Popish) Bishop of Ardagh. The community of which he was now the legal chief had been founded in 1022; and as the foundation was the consequence of a grateful movement at being saved from shipwreck, the monastery was built so as to represent, according to the architect's best ability, the hulk of a ship reversed. War and neglect had both visited the establishment with their inflictions; and what English hostility had left unscathed, French inattention had allowed to fall to ruin. The inhabitants, too, partook of the spirit of the place in which they dwelt, and the monks themselves are graphically described, in one word, as "the ruins of monks." Dominique Abbé du Val-Richer, speaking of La Trappe previous to the arrival of de Rancé, says—

"The gates remained open night and day, and men and women had alike free access to the cloister. The vestibule was so dark that it seemed more like the entrance to a prison than to a house of God. Here a ladder, placed against the wall, served for stairs to reach a flooring which could not be trodden without danger, so broken and decayed were the boards. The roof of the cloister had sunk into a concave form, and filled with water whenever there was a fall of rain; the pillars which supported it became bent; and the parlours were turned into stables. The refectory was only such in name. Monks and seculars played at bowls there whenever the weather interrupted their games in the open air. The dormitory was abandoned to the birds of night, and exposed equally to hail, rain, snow, and wind; each of the brethren lodged as he pleased, or as he could. Nor was the church in a better condition. The pavement was broken, the stones dispersed, and the walls threatening ruin. The belfry was ready to fall, and the bells could not be rung without shaking it to the foundation."

Turning from the building to its indwellers, we learn from M. de Chateaubriand, that

"When the Abbé de Rancé introduced his reform into his 'abbaye,' the monks themselves were but the ruins of monks. Reduced to seven in number, these fragments of *cenobites* were denaturalized by abundance or misfortune. For a long period they had merited reproach. As early as the eleventh century, the monk is declared by Adalbéron to be transformed into a soldier. In Normandy, a superior, having presumed to admonish his monks, was flagellated by them after his death. Abailard, who tried severity in Brittany, found himself exposed to poison. 'Rancé incurred similar dangers. No sooner had he uttered the word *reform*, than he was threatened with poison, the dagger, and the pond. A gentleman of the neighbourhood, M. de St. Louis,

offered his aid to the Abbé; but the latter declined it, with the remark, that the apostles had established the Gospel in spite of the powers of the earth; and that, after all, the greatest happiness was that of dying for the sake of justice."

The fear of God was not known to the seven monks over whom de Rancé held such disputed sway; but their fear of the king was excessive, and as their new superior had threatened them with the monarch's vengeance, they at last came to terms; they gave a tardy consent to the introduction of the *reform*; a pension of four hundred livres was granted to each; and they were to be permitted to stay or to depart, according to their own will. The falling in of a portion of de Rancé's chamber, his escaping unhurt, and the coincidence of the "*Qui confidunt in Domino*," being on the same day sung in the church, fixed him in his resolution of making the full monastic profession. His brief noviciate was performed, not without the *postulant* being occasionally refractory, and de Rancé returned to La Trappe, but not, as we should have expected, to become for ever a recluse from the world and its temptations. What property he yet possessed he now made over to other hands. Among his choicest treasures that he had hitherto preserved were the letters he had received from his *paramour*, the Duchess de Montbazou; these remembrances of his guilt he now resolved upon destroying; but the passage in which they are referred to, is too exquisitely French, in its mixed sentiment of love and of devotion, to allow us to venture upon giving our own version. We have recourse, therefore, to M. Le Vicomte, who says—

"Here we perceive Madame de Montbazou for the last time. Charming and fatal evening-star, about to descend below the horizon for ever! According to Dom Gervaise, de Rancé had a number of letters, and also two portraits of this lady. One represented her as she was at her marriage; the other as she appeared when she became a widow. These secrets of affection (such is the gloss which M. de Chateaubriand applies to an intercourse of the greatest criminality) had been entrusted to the safeguard of religion. La Mère Louise (the cast-off mistress of the Duke of Orleans, and of whom we have already spoken) had, as keeper of this deposit, the necessary weakness and strength—the indulgence of a woman who had sinned, and the courage of a woman who had repented. On the very morning he had made his vows, Rancé wrote to Tours to order the letters to be thrown into the fire, and the portraits to be sent to M. de Soubise, Madame de Montbazou's son. To break with realities (exclaims M. de Chateaubriand, overcome with admiration) is absolutely nothing! but with the memoirs of the past! The heart breaks on being divided from its dreams, so little is there in man of what is real!"

It is singular enough that de Rancé had no sooner taken his

vows, "to immolate himself for ever to the justice of God," and to cut himself off from the world, than we find him in the character of a traveller. He gave some general rules to his little society, and then hastened to Rome to defend his plan of *reform* before the sovereign Pontiff. He passed through Paris, to which capital he travelled like a beggar, in a cart; spent his time rather pleasantly at Rome, and showed his humility by neglecting to visit whatever was worthy of observation in that ancient city. But if he had the scorn of a recluse for the things of the earth, he had a very calculating affection for the men of the world; and it is not without a strong feeling of disgust and suspicion, that we read his flattery to Cardinal de Retz, a man who neither esteemed virtue nor affected decency. We value at nothing his living upon bread and water amid the luxuries of the world's capital—he belied his self-mortification by his abject wooing of bad men; and if he did but what he ought to have done, by attending a domestic through a long illness, he did also what he ought not to have done, by soothing the vanity of evil-doers who might become his friends. But at length, after repeated attempts to obtain the sanction of the Roman Pontiff to the *strict observance*, as it was called, of which he was the restorer, he departed for France loaded with Papal benedictions, and orders against the reform he had so ardently desired to introduce, under the authority of the Pope, into the various monastic orders—at least, of France. He determined, however, to found a Christian Sparta of his own; he arrived at La Trappe, but instead of the Sparta he had designed, he discovered a Sybaris which he had not contemplated. The monks had regarded their Pope more than their Prior, and in the absence of the latter had furnished their house with all the aids to easy comfort; they had stocked their larder with all the good things appropriate to the larder of high livers, and evidently entertained a firm conviction that luxury was, after all, a very pretty thing. To abolish this conviction was a task of some difficulty—perhaps of impossibility. But if the conviction remained, the practice, at least, was expelled; order and frugality were gradually introduced into the community; hospitality, in other words, charity, the distribution of food, was daily offered to upwards of four thousand comers—a fact which assures us that laziness must have had enormous encouragement where such a number of individuals looked with untroubled certainty to a single monastery for their daily bread; and the community itself was speedily increased by the ready refuge which it afforded to bandits, thieves, and every class of men flying from justice and the laws. De Rancé received all without question; his

only stipulation was, that each candidate should bring with him nothing but his soul: "La chair (says he), n'a que faire la dedans." All that he required after reception was strict attention to the following rules—rules which we transcribe from various pages of the author or "René," who himself derives them from the "Constitutions de l'Abbaye de la Trappe," Paris, 1674 :—

"At two o'clock every one must rise for *matins*. The summoning bell will strike rapidly, in order to prevent slothfulness. Great modesty of demeanour must be observed in church ; and all inclinations of the body, and genuflexions, must be made simultaneously. From the commencement of *matins* till the first psalm, each monk will remain uncovered.

"In the dormitory no one is permitted to *turn his head* ! and gravity is required in walking. No monk is allowed to enter the cell of another. A straw mattress, six inches thick, with a straw bolster, and a bedstead of rough planks, standing on trestles, will serve for a couch. Cleanliness is recommended in the refectory ; the eyes are never to be raised ; at the same time, none must incline the body too much over his food." "The recommendations (adds M. de Chateaubriand) touching the uses of the knife and fork, seem as if they were made for infants. The old man (says he), in the presence of God, returns to the innocence of his youthful days !"

In giving a *resumé* of the rules and regulations, he thus continues :—

"As soon as the bell calls to work, the monks and novices will assemble in the parlour, and afterwards proceed to their assigned tasks with great reserve and inward meditation, considering their labour as the first penalty of their sins. At the hour of recreation the news of the day must not be spoken of. During the *grandes sorties* the monks may silently retire with a book to some spot in the forest, at a distance from the society of the seculars. The chapter of sins (for their investigation) will be held twice a week. Previous to self-accusation, the whole assembly must lie prostrate, and the superior, saying '*Quid dicite ?*' every one, in a suppressed voice, will answer '*Meas culpas !*' No complaint must be heard in the infirmary from those who suffer. The sick man must have nothing before his eyes but the image of death, and have no apprehension of anything so much as of living." "On the death of the father or mother of a monk (we are told) the Abbé recommended the deceased, but without naming him, to the prayers of the chapter, in such a way that every one was interested as if for his own parent ; while, at the same time, the intelligence caused neither pain, nor anxiety, nor disturbance to that particular brother whom it most nearly concerned. The natural family was annihilated, and a family of God put in its place. And the death of a father was mourned as often as tears were shed for the unknown father of a brother in penitence."

The regulation enjoining all duties to be performed with the eyes directed toward the ground was so strictly observed, that we hear of a novice who had never seen the ceiling of his cell. In walking to prayers or to labour the first monk saw nothing but the ground at his feet; those who followed were conscious of nothing but the footsteps of him who preceded. One recluse enjoys the equivocal merit of having been, during three or four months, in constant proximity to his own brother without having once looked at him; and another, subsequently to the visit paid to the convent by the Duchess de Guise, accuses himself of having criminally indulged himself in a glance—not at the lady, but at the venerable bishop who accompanied her! Brother Parvenius, again, is distinguished for his great humility, and for his never looking into a book; the author of this biography actually has the simplicity to compare him with Moses, because he never entered the pantry without first putting the shoes from off his feet! This same humble personage is held worthy also for having his brother with him, and never giving him the slightest mark of being conscious of his presence. Such was the idea of holiness at La Trappe! In such a manner was our duty to our neighbours illustrated and performed by the children of the ex-libertine.

The third and final division in the life of de Rancé may be said to commence here. We have contemplated his fiery youth, seen his disturbed period of transition, and have now to view him as chief of a society, every member of which presented the spectacle of brutes tamed. The assassin, the robber, and the exhausted debauchee deposited his person and his passions at the feet of as great a sinner as themselves. They put off lawlessness, and assumed obedience. The fact, however, was, that one class of abuses and excesses was exchanged for another. The murderer no longer slew with the arm of violence, but he readily assassinated every living and praiseworthy feeling of nature, implanted in man by a hand divine. The robber made no compensation to the society he had despoiled; he rather still robbed it of services which he might have rendered. The debauchee sunk, or rose, into a droning devotee. All these men were, in their new characters, as useless to the world as they had once been positively injurious. We do not deny the hardness and the discomforts of their life; we do not indeed judge them at all as individuals; there is one great question lying between them and their Maker in which we have no right to interfere. But we cannot, on the other hand, refrain from remarking, particularly now, when good but mistaken men of our own Church are devoting their best energies in order to accomplish the foun-

dation of Protestant La Trappes in our own country, that when men became monks, they appear to have been influenced by the belief that the mere assumption of the monastic habit would secure their salvation, and that if they exchanged the livery of the world for the frock of a friar, they might, not to speak profanely, slip into heaven in disguise.

We will ourselves refrain from speaking of the motives of de Rancé, though they are not above suspicion; but we may notice, that during his own life he was loudly accused of vanity; and there certainly is a restlessness about him very inconsistent with a man professing to have done for ever with the world. It *appears* to us—for we wish to speak with charitable guardedness—that no little ambition peeps through the ragged gown of the recluse when he writes to Louis XIV., that during the period when monks lived in perfection they were looked upon as the tutelary angels of monarchies; that by their power with God, they held up the falling fortunes of empires; he implies that prophetic visions are granted to the holy recluse; and he adds, that his Majesty need not be surprised if he, de Rancé, who in the course of his profession is constantly at the foot of the altars of the King of Heaven, should once in his life present himself before the throne of the king of the earth. Are we wrong in asserting that this passage not only reveals personal ambition in the writer, but, in the parallel drawn between the Almighty and the King of France, descends to a flattery of human greatness which shows that *he* was well aware of the power of adulation and the charms of worldly elevation, who could so use one and regard the other, while professing to teach the utter nothingness and vanity of both?

Again, the obedience which he exacted from his own followers was unquestionable and complete; not so that which he paid to the spiritual sovereign of his own Church. His allegiance to the Pope was paid only as long as that prince of prelates did not oppose this factious religionary-feudalist. He acted in the teeth of Rome when his own conduct was censured there; he patronized and professed Jansenism, which the Vatican had pronounced, amid re-echoing thunders, to be damnable heresy. He placed the king in adverse position to the pope, as every ambitious spirit of his own religious faith has done when a purpose was to be gained, through raising the throne in hostile height against the tiara; and he elevated his own condition above that of the Papacy when, speaking of religious recluses like himself, he again pronounces them to be angels, through whose prayers states and empires find protection; arches which support the great vault of the Church; penitents, who on the fiery wrath of

God pour an appeasing torrent of tears; and brilliant stars which fill the universe with their splendour! Such is the man who, in the ear of the Almighty, whisperingly acknowledges himself a worm, while to the multitudes of his credulous fellow-creatures he trumpets himself forth "a triton 'mong the minnows."

And yet no sooner are we roused to strong suspicion by the publication of such sentiments, than we trace, and are willing to acknowledge, evidences of sincerity, when we contemplate the founder of La Trappe practising austerities by which he is nearly crushed, sinking under present disease, and inheriting life-long debility. But at the same time we discern that fatal error which destroys a vessel that it is our duty to preserve, and which defaces a temple in which the Creator has thought fit to lodge the soul. Heroically calm amid the monks dead and dying about him, de Rancé sits and speaks like an inspired prophet, but from under the same roof he pens long epistles to great, that is, *fashionable* people, in which, if there be much of religion, there is also something of the world; and in the very house of those who profess to hold no intercourse with human brotherhood or friendship, he receives the visits of St. Simon, famous for his gossiping anecdotes; and the calls of Pelisson, who, except that he was an apostate from the Protestant faith, was remarkable for nothing, that we ever heard of, but for having educated a spider!

That de Rancé should have received, conversed, and corresponded with the Eagle of Meaux, the accomplished Bossuet, has nothing in it that need excite our surprise. Whether the Trappists gave or acquired the lesson, we know not, but Bossuet was one of those ecclesiastics who, in the hour of emergency, reclined on the king's bosom, and stretched out an arm of defiance towards Rome. It is a more surprising circumstance to us that de Rancé, while affecting to scorn all human science and learning, should himself, in his letters, quote so lively a heathen poet as Aristophanes, and plagiarize from so questionable a moralist as the epicurean ode writer of Venusia. Indeed, he never looks so little as when inveighing against all knowledge, anathematizing study, and celebrating the daily apotheosis of ignorance. There is, besides, as little honesty as sense in this continuous condemnation of every degree of learning, particularly when we are made to remember that he who so authoritatively pronounced it was himself a laborious student rather of profane pages than Scripture or the Fathers. The cause of knowledge was admirably advocated by the illustrious Mabillon, himself the superior of an order; and who crushed the sophistries

of de Rancé with immense power, truth, and courtesy. He defended knowledge for itself, and for its humanizing uses; he showed that man became humble as his mind expanded; and he cited an interminable list of religious recluses, famous for their solid acquirements, their praiseworthy employment of them, and the everlasting gratitude which will be their tribute from the latest posterity, for having rescued treasures of inestimable price from oblivion, and for having transmitted them to their successors, purified, polished, and restored—a true medicine of the mind.

M. de Chateaubriand is himself, as all the world knows, an elegant scholar, but he is at the same time a profoundly bigotted Romanist; he consequently finds himself particularly embarrassed between his love for learning and his admiration for his hero. He stands turning from Mabillon to the Trappist, like Palæmon listening to the alternate strains of Menalcas and Ægon's herdsman; the difficulty of decision is to him immense, and, after all, it amounts to the compromising sentence of

“Et vitulâ tu dignus, et hic.”

To us the merit seems all on the side of Mabillon, whose illustrations in support of his argument are met by de Rancé with counter-examples, that do anything but serve the purpose of him who employs them. Chateaubriand thinks otherwise—and again, in the same breath, he refutes himself. Well he might, for here is absolutely all that de Rancé advances, by way of destroying what the author terms “the feeble portions of a great work:”—

“A certain disciple of Saint Benedict, named Mark, is made the object of praise, my brethren, because he could compose verses with ability. What commendation for a monk! I am quite certain that St. Benedict never bequeathed such a legacy to him in his will, nor taught him such a lesson by his example. What a qualification for a hermit, that he was a poet!.....Loup, Abbé de Ferrières is wrong in begging Pope Benedict III. to send him Cicero's work ‘De Oratore,’ the twelve books of Quintillian, and Donat's ‘Commentary on Terence.’ Would he not have done better had he retired into the deepest recesses of the cloister, there groaned over his own sins and those of the world, and given aid and support to his brethren, who in this iron age stand in need of succour and consolation?”

Chateaubriand pronounces this a clever reply to Mabillon, and yet, at the very end of the quotation, he adds, “Rancé se jette parmi les moines savants, pour en rompre l'ordonnance; il ne s'aperçoit pas qu'il les fait aimer.” “He ridicules Hubald (adds the biographer) for having written one hundred and thirty

verses in praise of *bald heads*; and de Rancé was right, but it served also to prove that a remnant of the raillery of the world still clung around him." Of course it does; and the advocate of dunces retired from the contest, as severely beaten and exposed as he deserved to be. He aroused against him the entire body of learned monks who cultivated erudition, as well as leisure, in their trim gardens; he met them all, indeed, with more obstinacy too than wisdom; but his brethren spared him not, they beat him to a mummy, cut the ground from beneath him, and tumbled him, without ceremony or courtesy, back from the world into his cell, where his gall remained so embittered that this charitable recluse cultivated and encouraged the evil feelings which it excited, by writing papers in praise of the ever-to-be-execrated revocation of the Edict of Nantes!! Yes, this exemplary recluse, with his eyes upon the cross, commends a lie; praises a work that was fraudulent in itself, and which led to murder; and calls the breaking of a covenant, and the first step to assassination, *a miracle wrought by the king!* Unlike the honest prophet in presence of the shepherd-sovereign of Israel, he not only exultingly contemplates the robbery of the lamb, but he publicly applauds the royal thief who committed it. In the presence of that royal criminal, for whose crimes (and particularly for this very revocation) France suffered such awful penalties, de Rancé appears at once to forget truth, honour, and honesty; his charity and his principles crumble to dust, and to very offensive dust too, when the wicked ambition of the king is in question. The English he styles *κατ' ἐξοχήν*—that *monarch's enemies*; and he rails against them—this pious, passionless, world-despising monk—with all the savage ferocity that marks the rabid effusions hourly poured at this very day from the infidel, God-denying columns of the *Siècle*, the *National*, and the *Presse*. We summon him as a witness against himself, and we ask if the lowest blaspheming republican, now penning incendiary falsehoods for a *feuilleton*, could write more characteristically of his vocation, than the founder of La Trappe does in the following passage upon the *perfidious English*:—"We have had fresh rejoicings" (says the recluse, who affected neither to entertain knowledge of what was going on in the world, nor to be in any way led away by it from heavenly contemplation, when reports *did* reach his ear)—"we have had fresh rejoicings at the defeat of the king's enemies, the English. I cannot imagine for what cause universal Christendom does not unite to accomplish their work, *the entire destruction of that kingdom of Satan!*"

Here peep out—here rather unblushingly exhibit themselves

to the world, that intolerance and cruelty which have ever distinguished, which do at present distinguish, and which will ever continue to distinguish the men whom Popery binds in her chains. These chains may be sometimes shaken in the face of Popery itself, but they who are bound *by* them, and who rebel *in* them, are ever ready to exchange them for an unshackled activity that shall give them an opportunity of burying the sword put into their hands in the bosom of all who oppose them. The writer of this biography is himself constrained to confess that "de Rancé would have been a man deserv^{ing} to be hunted out of society," but for a reason that our readers would never be able to divine, viz, "that he shared, and even surpassed, the rigours which he imposed upon others." M. de Chateaubriand thinks that no accusation can be made against an individual who answers by forty years of wilderness, who displays his ulcerated limbs, and who, far from complaining, increases in resignation of spirit, as he does in agony of body. We entreat our readers to consider what the accomplished author of the "Genius of Christianity" (a book, of which its enemies say that it neither displays Christianity nor manifests genius)—we entreat them to consider what even an enlightened son of the Romish Church pronounces to be a compensation for every sin. A semi-seclusion, which he poetically styles forty years of wilderness, a loathsome destroying of the body, and a stoical superiority to pain—these are sufficient replies to any charge of sin, or rather satisfactory reasons that no charge should be made. We trust that the father of *Atala* hardly means what he says—*aliquando bonus Homerus dormitat*; and we would fain hope that Chateaubriand was in somnolent unconsciousness when he penned such a passage as the above. If he were not, and if he not only wrote it deliberately, but will also maintain it advisedly, we are then compelled to say that he is infinitely more of an infidel than Voltaire himself who wrote his "Bababec et les Fakirs" expressly to throw ridicule upon the sentiment which the popular Viscount supports. Voltaire, in his *Fakirs contemplatifs*, saw the secluded, ignorant, ulcer-raising Trappists. It is true that he was himself in an opposite extremity of error, and accordingly could see no portion of the good that attached itself to the lives led by those monks, but was eager and acute enough to discern where they fairly lay open to satire, if not to sarcasm. In unending showers did the former descend upon hermits of La Trappe, whom he first metamorphosed into faquires of Hindostan, and then held up as examples of intense absurdity for looking for years together at the end of their nose after celestial light; for standing for months uninterruptedly on one leg; dancing for

weeks on a slack wire, without sleeping; or going about with their head in a bushel during their entire lives. De Rancé, according to M. de Chateaubriand, if we understand him rightly, and we almost hope we do not, is sinless, *because* he is suffering and useless. This appears to have been the old opinion also; and the philosopher of Ferney, with whom we certainly shall not be suspected of holding any sympathy, accordingly, and on this occasion, truly exposes such an opinion with, if we may be allowed an antithetical expression, severe good humour. He describes *Bababec*, the de Rancé of Hindostan, as going about perfectly naked, carrying sixty pounds weight of chain around his neck, and never sitting down but upon a wooden chair, the seat of which was covered with nails, that, with their points upwards, entered into his flesh.* A certain Omri consults the Indian de Rancé, and among other questions, asks him if he thinks that the enquirer, after undergoing seven metempsychoses, has any chance of reaching the dwelling-place of Brahma? "That's according to circumstances" (replies the Faquir); "how do you live?" "I endeavour (says Omri) to be a good citizen, good father, good husband, and faithful friend. I lend my money to the rich, when it is wanted, without usury; I give of my substance to the poor; and I maintain peace among my neighbours." "Do you ever run nails into your flesh, by sitting down on them?" (asks Bababec). "Never" (answers Omri). "Well, I am sorry for it (remarks the Brahmin), for you will never get beyond the nineteenth heaven; and that's a pity!"

Such is the satire of a man whose aid no Christian writer need certainly evoke, but whose pages may be quoted on this occasion to illustrate one of the two extremes of French society; namely, those who, like Voltaire, justify themselves by good works; and those who, with Chateaubriand, support justification by bad ones, such as self-afflictions and denials, which leave a

* That this picture of Bababec is not overcharged, if drawn from de Rancé, may be proved by citing, in the biographer's own words, the description given of the monk at the height of his self-inflicted sufferings and uselessness:—"Le Rhumatisme qui d'abord lui avoit saisi la main gauche, se jeta sur la droite, dans laquelle le chirurgien de Madame de Guise travailla. Cette main devint inutile et contrefaite. Le malade avoit une répugnance extrême de toute nourriture. Affligé d'une toux insupportable, d'une insomnie continuelle, de maux de dents cruels, d'enflures aux pieds, il se vit réduit, pendant près de six années, à passer ses jours à l'infirmerie dans une chaise, sans presque jamais changer de posture..... Il avoit fait mettre vis à vis de sa chaise ces paroles du prophète:—'Seigneur 'oubliez mes ignorances et les péchés de ma jeunesse.' Ce fut pendant cette perpétuelle agonie qu'il composa son livre intitulé, *Reflexions sur les quatre Evangélistes*."

man neither a good citizen nor a good Christian. Between the clouds of error and sin raised by the opposite parties, small is the company that are able to discern the star of truth, and, discerning, to keep their gaze fixed upon it for ever.

In the condition of disease and suffering to which de Rancé was reduced, his mind appears to be less prostrate than his body; he found time, or leisure from pain, to indite an immense number of letters, some of which are still extant. From a few of these M. de Chateaubriand regales his readers with extracts, that are not always edifying; as, for instance, when he writes to the Abbé Nicaise, in London, on the subject of marriage:—

“On one point heretics are unmanageable—that of penitence. They will allow of no other than that they find in marriage. Nor would they be so much in the wrong if it was the spirit of penitence that caused them to take a wife, with her bad humours, and all the inconveniences attending the condition. I cannot imagine any *La Trappe* that can be compared with that of marriage. Our own situation is a bed of roses, inasmuch as that we are well aware of what happens to married people!”

It was hardly worth while to retire from the world for the sake of abusing its uses in such a trashy guise as this. But to be critical, and censoriously so, was one of de Rancé's characteristics; he was nothing when not finding fault. On the occasion of his visiting, and for a time superintending, the nunnery at Clairets, he startled the whole convent by interdicting the reading of the Old Testament. Forgetting that to the pure all things are pure, he denounced the Song of Solomon, the histories of Susanna, Judah, Thamar, Judith, and Amnon, the Levite's wife, and Ruth, as unfit studies for those sworn to preserve an unsullied chastity. He directed attention to all that he considered an impurity, by naming it. He gave polluted interpretations to what bore a virtuous moral; and he found his interpretations disbelieved and his council unheeded. Indeed, the robbers, murderers, and other refugees who sought for safety of body or health of soul in the monastic captivity of *La Trappe*, were not half so intractable to his command or his exhortations as were the fair but stiff-necked daughters of the various convents of France. In one of these, a celebrated nunnery in Paris, the services of religion were performed with the aid of music—the latter de Rancé pronounced to be a wicked vanity, and, we know not on what authority, proscribed it accordingly. The nuns, however, persisted not only in their instrumental, but their vocal devotions. In the latter, nothing could stop them; they set de Rancé at defiance, and were only recalled to reason and obedience by the performance of a miracle, whereby they were

all suddenly stricken hoarse; and, in consequence of admonitory catarrhs, penitent also. They gave up their organ and recovered their voice!

The satires which the world levelled at the founder of La Trappe were for the most part made in as bad taste, and on as uncharitable a principle, as mark most things that come from so impure a source; but, on the other hand, they were not all destitute of truth. Very grave accusations were raised, from time to time, that the monks were engaged in a conspiracy, not only against the State, but against religion also. These accusations we are inclined to look upon as groundless. Mere personal satires, de Rancé, with rare wisdom, totally disregarded, or if he read them, it was to find them, as he declared, an excellent preparation for prayer. But there were others, directed against his system, which are neither ill-natured nor unfounded. Men saw much parade of triumph made for that system which, as far as society is concerned, had few good results. Against such an equivocal issue as this, a lasting shaft, less of ridicule than reproach, was driven, by the striking of a medal, which on one side bore the effigy of de Rancé, with the legend "*RESTITUTOR MONACHORUM*;" and on the other, the figure of a decrepit monk, beneath which stood the significant words—"*LABOR IMPROBUS*." We think this more nearly approaches to the truth than any other ridicule, written or spoken, made against the founder and his system. It shows what he effected, and it gives a name to the effect, all the more stinging for being true. Certainly such a founder exposed himself to the merited reproaches of his more active, and not less observant, fellow-men, when he displayed such mistaken ideas of duty, as his biographer narrates of him, with naïve approbation. On one occasion, M. de Chateaubriand tells us, that if by chance de Rancé, during his retired evening walks, met a covered waggon, he would ask permission to drive it, defending himself by remarking, "It is rather my duty to drive this waggon, than it is this poor peasant's; for, though he be poor, he is a righteous man, while I am for ever the most wretched of sinners!" If this be exemplary, it is certainly not of wisdom; the humility is of that nature that is akin to pride; and we can see nothing edifying in the picture of a sickly recluse vigorously bumping over the ruts and ridges of ill-kept fields, by the side of a grinning peasant, in a tilted cart!

It is a good demonstration of the difficulty attending the subject treated by M. de Chateaubriand, that the author himself is unable to refrain from adding a shaft to the many which have been shot against monastic life in general, and against that which distinguished the abbey of La Trappe in particular. It

is true, that in this instance the bolt, like the fools in the proverb, may have been unconsciously driven, but, whether or not, it reaches its mark. The author is alluding to the legions of demons which kept up their nightly and noisy revels in the monastery, to the terror of the monks. He tells of the sharp and piercing cries heard in the hours of sleep; of the monks being violently shaken in their beds; of the spectral iron hands which swept over their couches in the dark; of the knockings at the doors of the cells, and the confused noises of people quarrelling and fighting. He is at a loss whether to attribute these alarms to midnight storms sweeping through the desolate passages of La Trappe, or to the illusions of astrology still practised by de Rancé. Whatever they may have been, they ceased when the spiritual chief announced his intention of exorcising them; and M. de Chateaubriand interrogatively solves the mystery, by fancying that it may have a metamorphosed affinity ("souvenirs changés seulement de formes") with that description of the Latin élegist which says:—

"Quam juvat immites ventos audire cubantem."

Surely, when we remind our readers that this line is only half a sentence from Tibullus, and that the absent moiety runs as follows—

"Et dominam tenero detinuisse sinu,"

we are not far wrong when we declare, that the modern advocate of the Trappists is as severely satirical as ever were any of their ancient enemies.

But our fast-failing space begins to warn us that it is time to hasten to the concluding scenes of this strange biography. We can only allude briefly to the continued interest that de Rancé took in public affairs, the visits which he received from eminent persons, and, among others, from our own James II. and his natural son; and the circumstance that his infirmities so increased upon him, as to render it necessary that he should resign the post which he held as superior of the monastery. He accordingly abandoned its honours and its toils to Father Zosimus, who, like worldly persons equally modest, declared that no worse choice could have been made, but kept the dignity in spite of his opinion. De Rancé had now become a simple brother of the order; his task was accomplished, and there remained for him nothing but to die. Contemplating him on his comfortless couch of ashes, on which he lay down until his spirit had departed, we are constrained to say of this extraordinary being's life, what has been said of many a differently constituted hero, that nothing so became him as his leaving it.

Whatever may have been his errors or his vices—whatever ambition may have lain beneath his humility, he died the death of the righteous—serene, hoping, and humble; forgiving all, and, we trust, himself forgiven.

He was born, sixteen years after the death of Henri IV., in 1626; he passed away, as his biographer poetically expresses it, “de sa hutte d’argile à la Maison de Dieu,” in 1700, just fifteen years before the death of Louis XIV. His earthly sojourn had thus lasted nearly three quarters of a century; and of the seventy-four years of his life, he spent thirty-seven in the world, and thirty-seven in the cloister.

Such are the passages of a memoir which we gather, not without difficulty, from the last work which the aged Chateaubriand will, in all probability, ever give to the world; and when we think of this latter circumstance, we are inclined to receive with silent respect the farewell contribution made to literature by one who, though an *emeritus* now, has been in his day a valiant and worthy soldier of the republic of letters. We will, therefore, treat with lenity the biography which, had it come from a more youthful hand, would not have escaped without some censure. But we cannot extend a critical complaining to a venerable man who sits in his own grave, and tells tales to crowds of his listeners who surround him. Why should not that old man be garrulous? It is his vocation and privilege; and ours the duty to hearken to his words, although an occasional smile may cross our features as we mark the wanderings of memory and spirit in *him*, who, looking from the grave in which he sits and weeps, to the world which he once made glad, roams away into a hundred digressions, and keeps us marvelling as to how he will get back.

These digressions are, however, of so singular a nature, that they deserved to be mentioned for their very singularity. They are made on all and every occasion, however little germane to the matter is the opportunity seized for making them. A curiously confused and intricate style of writing is the consequence, for which were a name wanted, we should be disposed to call it the “tangent” style, seeing that the author touches upon nothing, however irrelevant, without immediately flying off from that circle which he has bound himself to portray. In this eccentric course he not only confounds places, but time. Never were these unities so violated as by him who, were he writing a critical defence of Corneille and Racine, would defend them with all the energetic ability of his pen. Thus, while intent upon some passage in the life of de Rancé, we are suddenly whirled away from the solitude into which we have followed him, and we

find ourselves now in an attic in Holborn, during the French Revolution; now at an earthquake in Grenada; anon we are in Belgrave-square with Henri of Bordeaux; again we are so suddenly elsewhere, and so rapidly in many places in succession, that we begin to dream of ubiquity; we lose sight of the stern recluse, we hardly know how; and after running through the French society of the Fronde, English tea-gardens, Florida, Kensington, the Holy Land, Cuba, and half the world beside, we find ourselves by the side of the monk again, taking up the thread of his history, with a sense of unconsciousness, and dreaminess, and confusion.

So much for the style of this curious work—we have now to speak of the object which its author had in view when he sat down to compose it, or rather, perhaps, the object which *they* had who put the pen into his hand. In speaking of this object, we must remark that the work was unwillingly undertaken by its author; and M. de Chateaubriand would have never been known to posterity as the public advocate of the great Trappist had he not been required by his confessor, the Abbé Seguin, to perform this meritorious work. This disrelish for his subject, or the distrust entertained by the author of his being able to treat it worthily, may account for many a disquisition introduced which has no more affinity with Richelieu's godson than it has with logarithms. However this may be, in satisfaction of the request made by his spiritual adviser, the book has been written by a *celebrité* of the past and the present century; and the object of its being written appears to us to be, not the lending an additional renown to de Rancé, or the rescuing him from some unmerited obloquy, but to *procure his canonization from Rome*, by reminding the Pope and the world of his pretensions to the honour of becoming a saint. From the day of his death till this present period, it would seem that a determination existed among his friends and followers to get him into the calendar, if possible. Lord Shrewsbury's daughter has lately been created one of the many Romish mediators between earth and heaven; and as that amiable lady has been canonized at no greater expense than the exercise of many pleasant social virtues, it is natural that the admiring friends of de Rancé should assert *his* claim to the same honour, founded upon the severer discipline which he observed, of sacrificing all social virtues, and living in defiance of them. What may appear greater claims are advanced, too, with what may seem proportionally greater boldness. His followers and his biographer do not scruple to declare that the grave was powerless to hold him. He was, indeed, buried in the cemetery of La Trappe, but we

are told, with pleasant confidence, by the author, that the shepherd, even after his death, wished to be in the midst of his flock, and that he appeared to divers persons, surrounded by clouds of glory. M. de Chateaubriand pauses to add, that there were authentic testimonies rendered to de Rancé serving to prove his right to canonization. Startling conversions, then resumes the author, were operated after his death. A monk, in his slumbers, heard the eucharistical wafer utter the words "tremble! tremble! tremble!" and he was so affrighted in consequence, that it was with difficulty he was recalled to the possession of his senses! Several epileptic patients, moreover, recovered from their infirmities by the touch of the linen which had covered the deceased hand of the reformer; and, as if affirmation were nothing without proof, the biographer assures his patient public, that all the necessary attesting certificates have been procured, and that Rome need, consequently, adopt no tedious process before she places so worthy a son on the roll of her saints. Upon which hint Rome will doubtless act.

And what did *he* teach, in whose behalf the honour of canonization is demanded from the Vatican? He taught men the way to death, and put such a terrible interpretation on the truth, that every action in our lives illumines the path to death with a fearful clearness, that he induced his followers to renounce action altogether, to withdraw into meditation, and to be as ungrateful as possible for their creation and preservation. The beauties and the usefulness of life were to him things unknown; he abused both in the days of his great sin; and in those of his perhaps well-meant, but ill-conducted, days of repentance, he abused them by a corresponding error of action, and in an opposite extreme. He was then as a man who takes in his hand the most exquisite of roses from the bosom of his mother earth, and plucking its leaves off one by one, declares, with a sneer, that he sees no beauty in it. To the innocent and the active, the seasons and their changes are full of enjoyment and valuable instruction; to the followers of de Rancé they are nothing but obstacles to heaven. To the former there is beauty in the party-coloured robe of Autumn, and they are grateful for the delicious fruits which she bears in her bosom; but in the eyes of the Trappist the demon of disease smiles fiercely over the ivory shoulders of the season; and the rich tribute of fruits which rolls from her fertile lap is but the means by which that demon works. Winter, too, hath its kindly comforts even for the lowly, who purchase them by their industry, and who can sink calmly into the arms of sleep, while he without is singing his hoarse and hearty lullaby; but to the followers of de Rancé he

is nothing but an adverse spirit, who flings a cold damp pall over half the universal world, giving acuteness to all the ills to which man dare not refuse inheritance. Again, the shady glens of Summer, and her murmuring brooks rippling music, while the sedate and silver moon listens to their tuneful mutterings, are, with all their poetizing charms, matters familiar to those happy ones around whom domestic love has flung the brightest of his chains; but in domestic love and conjugal affection the founder of La Trappe could see nothing but an antepast of hell; and, in summer itself, his finite and prejudiced sense was only aware that it afforded solitary and useless men, such as he was, verdant turf and brambles to bind upon their graves. The voices of Spring were musicless to him—he closed his eyes to her beauties—renounced her delights—and the spirit of the spirits of the seasons was powerless to tune his cold heart to ecstasy. He was ungrateful, and boasted of his ingratitude as though it had been a virtue. Surely they are wiser who can learn lessons of edifying rapture from the presence and enjoyment of the youngest of the children of the year. Oh! Spring, with thy mornings of gladness, thy days of activity, and thy evenings of happy communings; when the hearts of all animated nature seem to undergo a typical resurrection, and all inanimate nature appears to leap into life and be glad at the joy which it witnesses and feels; and when the affections themselves wear the guise of eternal and everlasting youth; oh! thou long-desired and short-lived one, surely heaven is made, in part, of thee; surely what we see of thee on earth is but the reflection of the undying splendour which lives for ever in realms above, bathing the fields of light with light still more intense, and shedding a brilliancy on angel pinions, from whence, in thine own May evenings, shoot downward through the sky those lustrous drops for which ignorant man has no other appellation than *falling stars*!

We have left ourselves but a very contracted space wherein to speak of the followers of Trappism. The most renowned of them were those who lived in the time of de Rancé, and who died ere he had yet completed his long and strange career. Of the biographies of these men the founder of the reformed Trappist has himself bequeathed to posterity no less than six goodly volumes, each containing details of the life, conversion, and retreat of some ten or a dozen penitents. Chateaubriand, in speaking of them, says that the highways of the world were covered with those who were fleeing from it, and adds, that de Rancé went out to gather them together, at his own risk and peril. In the extraordinary shaped phrase of the noble viscount,

"The monk brought home, in the skirt of his robe, burning cinders, which he sowed upon the fallows in order that he might fatten the wilderness with fragments of the passions!" One of these *burning cinders*, which de Rancé flung into the fallow of the Carmelites, was no less a person than Madame de la Valière, whose repentance, humanly judging, was much more sincere than was that of men who fancied that a denial of the world's uses was full and sufficient atonement for its abuses. What the ideas of M. de Chateaubriand are concerning repentance in general may be guessed at from the way in which he writes, and we think unfoundedly, of that of the almost innocent victim of the licentiousness of Louis XIV. According to the author of "*Atala*," she, who was an affectionate mother, would not allow any one to speak to her, even of her own son. "She imagined (says Chateaubriand) that no man but the king might fittingly share her thoughts; and in her solitude she dwelt beneath the veil with—*God and Louis!*" When the aged writer makes such errors in religion as this, we need no longer be surprised at his errors in morality, whereby he tolerates the infamies of George Sand, and holds that virtue may be insulted, if it be only wittily done; nor need we be astonished at his not less singular error in history, by which he makes our own honest Saxon Shakspeare to be a descendant from the Normans; thereby intimating, in his vanity, that we owe the dread mysteries of *Macbeth*, and the high philosophy of the young Dane, to no other source than to his own *belle France!*

The man who, of all others in modern times, is most celebrated for his love and his recommendation of solitude, is Zimmermann; and he was so odious a character that his very daughter, after long and afflicting struggles to bear with his dreadful oppression, fled from her father in affright and disgust. The incentives to seclusion given by de Rancé are, as might be expected, very different from those to be found in the well-known book of the philosopher of Brugg, and "physician of his British Majesty." Both, however, agree that man was formed for society: the difference between the philosopher and the priest is, that the former would render man fit for heaven by enabling him to perform his allotted task on earth; while the latter professes to show that heaven may be won by the abandonment of the world alone. One enjoined life—the other a long and tedious suicide. The followers of de Rancé were expressly taught by their master that the corruptions of society were to be escaped only by renouncing the world; and he curiously strains his arguments, on behalf of solitude, into proofs of their excellency, by reminding his spiritual children that the

promised land was not given to the Hebrews till they had wandered forty years in the wilderness; and that if *they* would gain heaven, they must first receive their instruction from Moses, to whom God did not manifest himself until he had first abandoned the palace of the King of Egypt and retired to the desert.

To the desert of La Trappe, de Rancé drew, during his own lifetime, nearly two hundred members, and these principally men worn out with the abuse of the world, or fleers from the strong hand of justice. One of the most celebrated of these candidates for immortality was a certain Pierre Fore, a man steeped to the very lips in every monstrosity that can sully a human being, and who, when weary with slaying his fellow-men, and with being on the point of being overtaken himself by the hand of the executioner, determined to change his condition. He accordingly became a Benedictine, under the imagination that a transformation of costume would be attended with a corresponding change of morals; but his outrages against the laws of God and man continued so frequent, and were of such deep atrocity, that he was compelled to fly from the pursuit of the officers of the law. He had not yet made up his mind whether he would take refuge in Germany or England, or go farther and assume the turban and the belief of the Moslemminn! At the very moment of his hesitation he happened to fall in with a priest who knew La Trappe, and gave such an account of its seclusion and discipline, that the moralizing murderer determined at once to avail himself of its shelter. The priest declared he would follow so good an example—but he added to his declaration the curious proposal, that as they were about to embrace a course of life, the penance and austerity of which were excessive, they could not do better than enjoy a few days' diversion together before they bade farewell to the world for ever. Fore showed some sincerity by scouting the proposal: he hurried forthwith to the monastery; demanded, rather than solicited, admission; and obtained it less by his air of humility than by the wild and ferocious countenance, by the aid of which he terrified the Abbé into enrolling him among the novices. Such was the man who had many equals among his brethren. By their conversion we are by no means edified, nor by their subsequent conduct much persuaded. The description of the life of one is the monkish biography of all. Fore, like his brothers, made a god of de Rancé, and looked to reach heaven through the merits of his superior and his own sufferings. The repentance which is detailed to us in the Abbé's own work has far less the appearance of sorrow for sin, than it has that of fear for its consequences. The same tale is told of all, and so often is

it repeated, that it at last becomes equally tedious and ludicrous. They all catch cold; the colds always terminate with disease of the lungs; ulcers and abscesses devour every part of the body; it is made a merit that he who cannot swallow, but with intense agony, allows the hour of dinner to pass by without complaining that his repast is not brought to him; and he to whom all positions are productive of the same torture is pointed to as a bright example, for sitting for hours together on some hard seat, rendered almost intolerable from the sharp bones of the monk actually starting through his skin, and from the loathsome and inflammatory sores sticking to the impure dress which was worn during the slumbers and labours of the day, nor yet laid aside during the dreams and labours of the night. Of this mingled devotion and dirt we will treat no further; we refer our readers to the "*Relations de la mort et de la vie de quelques Religieux de l'Abbaye de la Trappe*," wherein they will find implied the unseemly doctrine, that nastiness gives a title to salvation.

This mysterious order still exists; its root yet flourishes in France, and its branches have extended even to Protestant England. Its members reject the teaching of St. Augustine, who said, "*Qui laborat, orat.*" The Trappists yet do both, commencing their monotonous task an hour after midnight; living temperately, for which they are not to be blamed; and declaring friendship to be "a Pagan virtue," for which they are open to reproach. The modern monks are, we presume, not less devout, as they are said to be not less dirty, than their long-passed-away predecessors. They are to the full as fond of ignorance; while they are, we fear, more fully given to an affection for the buttery hatch than were their earlier brethren, for among the modern rules we find one prohibiting admission to the kitchen, as though, like St. Wulstan, they did not always deeply decline roast goose.

Such were, and such are, the men who are educated to consider the love of existence a sin, and who remain buried captives, for ever cut off from nature and all her joys. To such beings, torn away from the communion of their fellow-men, action or activity is alike impossible. Their virtue, as is remarked by Tieck, consists in the chanting of a hymn; their vice, in the neglect of a single prayer. They fix their hollow eyes on the pages of a breviary, and fancy they have done more than the man who, amid the tumult of the world, has, with heaven-inspired affection, sustained a sinking brother in his need. The rule of their order is to them the standard of virtue. The life of man is ennobled by the culture of his reason and feelings. While reason and feelings are, to the Trappist, alike profitless

and impossible, the religiously useful man of the world struggles to keep himself awake from that moral sleep of slothfulness which enwraps the monks of de Rancé's school. Pity them we may, for they are the victims of good intentions, annihilated by running into the vice of extremes. Pity them ! but, above all, be not thou the first to rebuke them, oh, self-satisfied hypocrite, who complacently disregardest the teachings of the Church, to lose thyself in the mazes of thine own conceits and in the dangers of thine own self-righteousness. First learn to obey, ere thou blamest the excess of obedience in another—thou, whose charity is of that quality that it would almost refuse salvation to all who are not of thine own parish, or who sit not under thy favourite minister ;—the humble and hoping, though mistaken monk, is preferable to the weak and arrogant thing that thou art !

ART. V.—*The Gospel before the Age ; or, Christ with Nicodemus. Being an Exposition for the Times.* By the Rev. ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., Oxon, Minister of Percy Chapel, London. London : Baisler. 1844.

WE rather like quaint titles, provided they convey the true meaning ; but this title, "The Gospel before the Age," does not well express the purport of this book, and to most persons would give an erroneous impression. The theme which Mr. Montgomery has taken up is far larger, and at the same time more definite, than we had imagined from the title of the book ; it is no less than maintaining that the claims of religion are, in every sense, and under all circumstances, paramount—above all secular things, and at the root of all secular things—as furnishing the only principles in the light of which anything can be rightly done, or any institution be set upon a solid foundation. And this religion, not the mawkish sentimentalism called natural theology, nor even those commonplace and elementary truths of Christianity which are usually understood by the phrase "the Gospel ;" but Christianity, in its length, and breadth, and heights, and depths, as coming from God and leading to him, and beholding all things but as instruments for accomplishing his will and making him known—or, failing of this, as useless and purposeless at best—too probably as offensive and criminal. A noble theme, and right nobly is it handled ; and fain would we hope, and prophecy if we durst, that it is but the forerunner of other works of the same high stamp, and in a still loftier and more energetic, because more highly wrought, and therefore

more terse and nervous, strain. For if we mistake not, Mr. Montgomery has now found his proper element, and then he will feel it to be so, and will delight in it, and grow more and more into conformity with it, and may hope to produce English discourses rivalling those of Chrysostom or Basil in eloquence and power, yet adapted to the deeper and more accurate theology of the present advanced age of the Church—sharpened by the subtleties of the schoolmen, and hardened and disciplined by the controversies with Rome.

Mr. Montgomery will pardon us if we say that we have often been grieved and pained by his former writings, not because they were reprehensible, but because they showed that he was not in his right element. We cannot say that he was out of his depth, for his footing was firm enough at all times, and there was no want of power or of self-confidence; but he was grasping after things which had not enough of tangible reality for him, and so sometimes appeared visionary and obscure; at other times, unnaturally inflated. But in his present work he has a reality on which he has laid firm hold; and this, though a reality, gives the most ample scope for imagination to soar for ever, yet not grow bewildered, and on which eloquence and passion may dilate for ever, yet the subject not become exhausted thereby.

Our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus forms the groundwork of this volume—a passage of Scripture which has been less frequently understood, and more frequently perverted, than any other of the same promineney; minds of one class shrinking from it altogether, as above their comprehension; and minds of another class, who dare rush in where angels fear to tread, dogmatizing upon subjects they do not understand, with arrogance derived perhaps from the synod of Dort, but improving, if we may so speak, upon their model. This discourse is first opened by Mr. Montgomery in a very masterly manner, and then the theological and practical principles which have been thus acquired or ascertained are brought to bear upon the Church, and made to test the maxims of state, and applied to the various practices in the world, and chief relationships of society, and domestic or social duties, as subsisting around us, and subjects of daily notice. And it thus comes out, and is made manifest, that the Gospel is not merely believing in the NAME, but is also participating in the NATURE, of the Lord Jesus, by regeneration. And then—

“That there are features in the existing age which, more than at any period since the apostolical, tend to illustrate man as he is, *according to God's description*, in contrast to man as he wishes to be, *according to his own presumption*. And here it is that, in a most peculiar

sense, we shall find the Gospel of Christ to be vastly BEFORE THE AGE—that is, utterly and infallibly, by its prescient wisdom, and spiritual acquaintances with humanity in all its corruptions, capacities, and exigencies—**ANTEDATING ITS MANIFESTATION OF SIN AND SUFFERING**; while at the same time it offers the grand and only relief for its weaknesses and wants.” (p. 6).

In order to this, our “participating in the nature of the Lord Jesus,” it was necessary that he should first partake of ours; and accordingly the Son of God became man, and assumed our nature in all respects, sin only excepted. It was necessary too, not only as it regarded us, but as it regarded him—

“For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God.” (Heb. ii. 16).

And as a consequence of the incarnation, and as a preliminary to our being made partakers of the divine nature, Jesus, who knew what was in man, did not at once commit himself to any, and ministered the Gospel, and kept himself who is the substance of that Gospel, in accordance with this his knowledge of man. The exposition of the discourse with Nicodemus is introduced by some striking remarks on the conclusion of the preceding chapter, showing how it was, that though “many *believed* in his name when they saw the miracles that he did,” yet “Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men.” That, in addition to the ordinary sense of the words, they also imply the little “worth of convictions which cause the intellect to repose in the bare fact of divine credentials; and from this style of tacit rebuke we may infer, that between the Saviour and the human spirit these mental convictions still leave a mighty and momentous gap.” (p. 10). And touching what is implied in the declaration, that “he knew what was in man,” we must extract rather a long passage, to do justice to Mr. Montgomery, by putting our readers in possession of the argument:—

“If we refer this perception of what is in man to Christ, as a **CONSTITUTED PERSON** in the mediatorial covenant, and as the **HEAD OF THE HUMAN REGENERATION**, many and manifold are the trains of thought which this view opens to the meditative Christian. Among others, contemplate this for a moment—that the distinct conjunction of infinite glory with finite dependency, in the oneness of the Redeemer’s person is not only unto us the great mystery never to be fathomed, but it is **THAT** which separates our Immanuel, by an unshared peculiarity, from **EVERY BEING**, created and uncreated, in the universe. For not the **FIRST** person, nor the **THIRD**, but the **SECOND**, the **Only-begotten**, has

been *MADE of a woman*, made under the law. Thus, then, while in Godhead he is allied, with unutterable essence, both to the Father and the Spirit; and while in manhood he is bound to the entire family of human nature by the link of incarnation—in the complex unity of his person, arising out of his incarnated state, the Redeemer stands *apart* from all that was, is, or shall be. Now the purpose of this remark is to introduce your minds to a sound view of the Redeemer, as exercising *HIS CREATED MIND*. For if, in idea or principle, we absorb the human into the glory of the divine, or confuse the divine with the reality of the human, how can we reverence with awe and gratitude the operations of that Spirit who equipped the Mediator's faculties for all their functions? Or (and this bears directly on the subject) what becomes of the *OFFICIAL GLORIES* of Messiah, unless with sacred tenacity we hold fast the Catholic truth—that while, as Christ, he was essentially God, in all the essence of deity; so he was economically man, in all the fulness of humanity? Believing this, therefore, when we refer the words, 'He knew what was in man,' to Jesus, as furnished by the Spirit, thus to interpret the universal heart of our human creation, what a crown of intellectual majesty is here put on the head of him who was to the blind and base creatures around him nothing more than the carpenter's son! And that we may not content ourselves with a magnificence of a mere generality, just consider the height to which this knowledge of internal humanity elevates our Lord above all who profess to be philosophers of the heart, and to dive into the fountain depths of its movements.

"Touching, then, this heart-knowledge, it is rightly estimated as inferior only to our knowledge of God. For, next to the divine nature, what is so spiritually interesting to us as the human? Accordingly, in every age of mankind, he who has descended into the moral deeps of humanity with the most daring plunge, searched them with the most refined sagacity, and drawn up and out, for instructive analysis, the secrets which he beheld there—that writer has ever been foremost in our admiration. Nor is it scripturally needful to deny the nature or diminish the extent to which the piercing eye of profound genius, before Christ and since, both read and unrolled that volume of paradox—the heart. Nor can it be forgotten that history, suffering, experience, daily example, public crimes, private vices, our own consciences, characters, conditions, and trials—each in their mode and measure may instruct us as to much that is *IN* man, by the obvious illustration of what thus comes *OUT* of him. Above all, we are bound to remember that the fall of man, and the Bible, most awfully and fearfully impress upon every reasonable mind lessons on the hidden workings of our inmost souls. But let all this be duly considered, and still we reiterate the truth—if Christ needed not that *ANY* should *TESTIFY*, because he knew what was *IN* man, how paramount is Christ over every created being, as a spiritual detector of the heart, soul, and spirit of mankind! For, to omit what might be said as to the fact, that we need much testimony *from* man, before we can safely reach a conclusion even as to a little that is *in* him; and also not to linger on another fact, that unto the last moment of consciousness the most ripened

saint is **READING** his own weakness and sin ; without placing any stress upon all this, by varied considerations we may prove that it is the alone prerogative of Jesus, as the moral prophet of man, to be the greatest expounder of the heart which has ever visited our world with light, warning, and love.....But even yet we may illustrate words which ascribe unto the Saviour an infallible detection of man's buried heart, by a reference which the following passage from John vi. may properly introduce—' There are some of you which believe not : for Jesus knew **FROM THE BEGINNING** who they were that believed not, and **WHO SHOULD BETRAY HIM.**' Conjoin with this allusion to our Lord's betrayal his own frequent predictions of his death. Above all, ponder on the dread intensity of soul which works and writhes its way through the meaning of this tragic verse—' I have a baptism to be baptized with, and **HOW AM I STRAIGHTENED (ANGUIshed)** till it be accomplished !' When the spirit of these quotations is condensed, you will at once admit the assertion, that our Lord not only knew what was in **MAN**, so far as man's nature was related to the world, the flesh, to Satan, and itself ; but, moreover, he knew what was and would be in man as respected himself also. In other words, he knew that as effectual principle and moral root, **THE CRUCIFIXION OF AN INCARNATED GOD WAS IN MAN !** Most truly, therefore, and with awful pre-eminence, might there be ascribed unto Jesus a thrilling perception of our deicidal enmity towards God. For, long ere they emerged from their dismal hiding-place, our Lord beheld, far down in the depths of their secret depravity, those infernal **PRINCIPLES** of sin which hereafter should embody themselves in the crucifixion of himself. And when we read of Gethsemane's agony and Calvary's groan, let us imagine (if we can) what were the human feelings of Christ, as he moved about the home and around the hearts of men, in whose murderous hate he saw prepared all which gave to that agony its bloody sweat, and to that groan its direful pang—a groan which was the echo of a Saviour's broken heart." (pp. 13-18).

This view of the knowledge of the human heart which was possessed by Christ is very amply developed and illustrated by many passages of Scripture, in order to prepare for the exposition, given by Mr. Montgomery, of the discourse itself ; which he conceives does not appear to be an answer to the enquiry of Nicodemus, unless we understand it as being directed to the thoughts which were passing through his mind, and not to the words he spake. It was (Mr. Montgomery believes) the wonted habit with our Lord, who knew what was in man's heart quite as accurately as he heard what came from man's tongue, to answer, not so much the speech of the lip, as the state of soul from whence the speech proceeded ; and by directing his words not so much to the language of those who addressed him, as to the inward and secret disposition which that language but *partially* unveiled, Christ was perpetually indicating his title to be indeed " come from God." (pp. 33, 35).

And the announcement which our Lord then made to Nico-

demus concerning the necessity of regeneration, or the heavenly birth, is shown to be the very truth which he, and all in a similar state of mind, need to know, and to have pressed upon them, as the *sine qua non* of salvation, without which they cannot enter, cannot even discern, the kingdom of heaven—cannot comprehend what is meant by the expression. There is much that is very well thought out, and very well put thereupon; but this, which is the most deep and important part of the subject, is just that part of the book in which we would wish greater severity and also simplicity of style. Deep contemplations, which absorb the whole soul and spirit of a man, should be handled in a quiet, simple style, in order not to disturb that grave, continuous, sustained effort of meditation which such subjects require; and any mere intellectual exercise, any excitement of the imagination or fancy, interferes with this, and jars upon that solemnity of spirit and abstraction of thought which we speak of. How free from everything of a disturbing nature are the discourses of our Lord! And that portion of Scripture which comes nearest to the discourses of our Lord—the epistles of that disciple whom Jesus loved—and which partake most of the depth of the divine word, partake also the most of its simplicity. We are pretty sure that Mr. Montgomery will understand what we mean, but it is better to leave no doubt of it, by adducing an instance; and we take one of the first that turns up (p. 40):—

“But not so with the Lord of glory. And lo! at once, as if a flash of truth smote through all the clouds which curtained up the retirements of Nicodemus’s soul.”

This kind of writing is unsuitable to such a subject; and, moreover, it reminds us too much of one of the faulty passages of Shakspeare—

“Nor heaven peep through the blanket of the dark to cry, ‘Hold! hold!’”

Passing this fault of style, there is great truth in the exposition given of this discourse with Nicodemus, and it is very clearly shown wherein the new birth, or regeneration, consists, and wherefore it is so indispensable in order to our being admitted into the kingdom of heaven:—

“‘Born again’ is synonymous with ‘born of the Spirit;’ and that which is born of the Spirit resembles its celestial parent—namely, it is spirit. As God, in the first creation, made man in *his own image*, so the Holy Ghost, in the second creation, produces a similitude unto *his divine self*. Thus, to be born again, in the general, amounts to this—the having imparted by the Spirit, unto our entire nature, a living, quickening, renovating and transforming power, presence, or principle, called spirit; which spirit further so coalesces with our faculties and

their operations as to become like a new mind within the mind, a new heart within the heart, and a new soul within the soul." (p. 81).

And with the same clearness it is shown, that as the kingdom of heaven is *spiritual*, so this preparation for it is indispensable, and is also the special peculiar work of the Holy Ghost in the Gospel scheme, as incarnation, with its accompaniments, was the special glory of the Son; and all are equally necessary to be kept distinct, that the Triune God may become known, and the Trinity in Unity find its manifestation. This is argued at length, and under several heads. We extract one of the shortest:—

"5. THE OFFICIAL GLORY OF THE THIRD PERSON IN GODHEAD is another proof that man unrenewed CANNOT belong to the spiritual kingdom of Christ. All his work in the application of Christ unto human consciousness is seminally *contained* in his washing of regeneration and renewing (Tit. iii. 5). But since to see the kingdom of God, or to become an inheritor of the glories which Jesus has bought by his own blood for his people, is the object to which the entire operations of our divine Regenerator subserve, it demonstrably follows, that if men CAN partake of such glories without a spiritual new birth, *the work of the Sanctifier becomes null and void*. In that case the Holy Ghost may cease to 'take of the things of Christ and show them unto man,' because man (on this absurd hypothesis) is quite adequate to show them unto himself." (p. 105).

The last point discussed in the exposition is the "kingdom of God, what it means, and when and where it shall be established."

"But an IDEA so religiously sublime as this—an IDEA, for the exhibition of which the person of Immanuel is set up from everlasting; of whose splendours, glories, and royalties all creation is more or less a veiled symbol or instructive type; to prepare for whose triumphs the economies of providential government have ever been dispensed, and for whose UNIVERSAL AND VISIBLE ESTABLISHMENT ON EARTH everything which is now transacted in the Church of grace is a prelude and an introduction—an IDEA, we say, so exceedingly majestic as this, would take a volume of itself even partially to unfold. Our attempt, therefore, will be, a humble effort to contemplate some of the more prominent traits which declare this kingdom as the centre of all revelation; and that to which the prophecies, prayers, and praises of God's elect have, in every age of the Church, pre-eminently referred." (p. 112).

And this portion of the volume is strikingly wound up in the following words:—

"Therefore, as certainly as this decidual earth once saw Messiah bleeding upon a cross, and received him into a grave, and from a mountain beheld him soar in mysterious triumph up to heaven, shall the same earth once more see him as her ENTHRONED MONARCH, when the KINGDOMS of this world are become the KINGDOMS of our God and *MIS* CHRIST for ever.

And with an equally striking application of the whole to men's consciences.

Should, therefore, the eye of any sceptical mocker happen to light on these views of a divine birth, and his proud reason be tempted to exclaim, "*How* can these things be?"—or should any Christian, falsely so called, who confounds the cold admission of mere dogmas into his mind, with a warm reception of experimental truth into his heart, be inclined also to repeat the rabbi's demand—for both we have a solemn answer in the following words of Christ:—

"If I have told you **EARTHLY THINGS**, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of **HEAVENLY**?"

Now what less can the spirit of such an argument imply than this—that if man's incredulity reject the doctrine of a spiritual regeneration, which, although a mystery, is yet among earthly things—that is, demonstrable to our terrestrial experience here, in the body of our flesh—how is it morally possible for him to believe that more hidden mystery of God's pardoning love **IN** Christ which was a heavenly thing, high up in the attributes of his nature, before all worlds? In other words, let no man be so insane as to imagine that he can spurn the doctrine of being regenerated, and yet at the same time hold fast to the privilege of being **JUSTIFIED**. The same Gospel which contains the glorious proclamation of a life unto death in the atonement of Jesus for the guilt of man, with equal explicitness again and again asserts the necessity of a regeneration for the depraved nature **IN** man. Let no one, then, presume to say, "*I believe* in the dying love of Christ," who cannot also with holy truth say, "*I experience* his regenerating power." Without the latter, our confidence in the former is a figment of the deluded mind, which, alas! by the Antinomian world, is too often mistaken for the faith of a believing heart. But *this* is the theology which God himself has sealed as divine—"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is **BORN OF GOD**." (1 John v. 1)—(p. 122).

We have dwelt thus long upon, and extracted thus largely from, the expository part of this volume, although it only forms a third of the whole, because it is upon his character as an expositor that Mr. Montgomery's claim to be heard must rest—and the force of the application of these principles to the age must depend upon that exposition of the Gospel upon which they professedly rest. Besides, our object has been to inform our readers, as fully as we are able, of what Mr. Montgomery's views are, that all may be able, so far as they agree with him, to carry out these principles in their own way; and that those

who desire to see how Mr. Montgomery would carry them out may refer to the work itself, for our space will only allow us to give a very imperfect sketch of the APPLICATION which extends through two hundred and seventy pages.

In applying his principle to all men, and to all alike—to clergy and laity—high and low—rich and poor—learned and ignorant—old and young—men of business and men of retirement—saying to each one of them that he can only do his duty by the grace of God, and only enter heaven on the Gospel terms, Mr. Montgomery does not expect that this doctrine of universal regeneration, which in the days of Christ was looked upon as an offensive paradox and startling dogma, will be regarded as less so now. Nevertheless, he presses it equally upon all, and shows how, if it were experimentally received by all, all would be constrained to act for the remedy of existing acknowledged evils. Thus, in the Church of England, or the Established Church, while it, as a body, consists of the blessed company of all faithful people, yet out of them there is a reserved class, or privileged order of consecrated functionaries, who preside, according to their relative position, over the undained members of the Church.

"Now the position we take is this—that man's corruption by sin, and his entire renewal by grace, such as Christ preaches to Nicodemus, are the two GREAT TRUTHS which the officers of our Church are bound, by every mode, means, and instrumentality in their power, to apply to the festering sores of political excitement, as well as unto all the seeming miseries and social horrors, that are at work around." (p. 148).

"But still it may be asked, what is the CONNEXION between man being born again by divine renewal, and the cure of his political discontent and the social disorganization of the lower classes? What is the connexion? Why, we may well answer, *what* is the character of *that age*, and the state of moral feelings in a country, when such a question as this can be put at all? How base must that philosophy be, and how utterly incompetent to legislate for the conditions or to interpret the real wants of fallen humanity, that imagines spiritual religion to be anything less than the actuating root of ALL PUBLIC VIRTUES, as well as of all private excellences! Verily, the far-reaching wisdom of Burke discerned no phantom, but described a substantive evil, when he spoke of an age of economists—economists and calculators. And, alas! in our low views of the SACREDNESS of a state, as well as our blind ideas of religion as the finest and most effective guardian of ALL our relative duties, how forcibly are we indebted to certain theories of Warburton and Locke, and to their expanded developments, as found in the system of Paley, and the grovelling utilitarianism of Bentham! In opposition to this, let us maintain, that ~~as~~ the divine renovation of our whole being by the transforming power

of grace is the true and only elevation of man ; so, in that elevation, whatever tends to support law, sanction order, and strengthen government, is virtually contained. Thus, then, can it be demonstrated, that he who most clearly, by the Spirit, can see *the kingdom of God*, will be at the same time most competent to comprehend and venerate *the kingdom of man* also." (p. 156).

This gives some idea of the way in which "the Gospel" is brought to bear upon "the age." But the principle is applied in all the various quarters and to all the various instruments by which the character of the age is moulded and fashioned, or by which it finds its expression. The popular literature of the day, in its various branches, is surveyed, and is found to be lamentably deficient in acknowledgment of these fundamental truths (pp. 163-218). The principle is applied to our social habitudes in their various relationships (pp. 219-288); and in the last place, it is applied to **THE RESTLESSNESS OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT, AS IT SEEKS TO ORGANIZE ITSELF UNDER A VAST AND VARIED SPIRITUAL MOVEMENT IN THE CHURCH:—**

"And, assuredly, that there is a mysterious something about the **CHURCH MOVEMENT** not to be paralleled by any agitation, mental or ecclesiastical, since the English Reformation, derives a striking authentication from the fact, that parties, principles, and persons, by education and habit most alienated from such a question, have been, almost without a choice, and sometimes in defiance of their direct wish, **ABSORBED INTO IT.** We have applied the term 'mysterious' to this movement, because.....there is a profound and nameless influence at work, which rather possesses and controls the man, than allows man to possess and control itself. The purged eye of faith..... daily begins to discern the shadowy presence of **THAT HAND** which is the **grand REGULATOR** of all movements, whether in matter or in mind. Such, in part, is a description of that indefinite awe which is gathering round the hearts of lonely thinkers and meditative speculators on humanity at the present hour. Influences, not the less real because they are spiritual, and apply to those departments of our consciousness over which earthly legislation has no control, are felt to be at work within and without us: the whole heart of the empire is being stirred down to its moral depths ; while the intellect of the age appears to be undergoing those pangs and throes which are significant preludes of a momentous transition into a new order of principles, opinions, and ideas. That the **CHURCH OF CHRIST** should be at once the centre of all motion and the circumference of all action in this national crisis is perfectly explicable to those who have learnt of God's Spirit what a **SPIRITUAL ORGAN** the Church is ; and how, notwithstanding the grovelling counteractions of a commercial period, the **ETERNAL** and the **INVISIBLE** still maintain their hold over man." (p. 290).

In tracing out the various features of this movement, and how

it is aggravated by spiritual workings within and by physical pressure without, till it becomes uncontrollable, and forces a vent in some terrible explosion, Mr. Montgomery shows great observation of what is actually going on around us, and clear discernment of the inevitable consequences of such things, if suffered to go on much longer unchecked. And he has cause for believing that one of the worst features in our condition is, that those whom duty should constrain and interest should prompt, from the dictates of reason alone, are not sufficiently active on the occasion; and he would rouse them and all others by higher and nobler motives—by showing that religion and the fear of God now calls for the exertions of all, and that not merely our well-being, but our very existence, is at stake. This, which is the practical part of the volume, will be read with the greatest interest by most persons; and it is full of accurate details, from authentic sources, of the grievances which press upon the Church and cripple her efficiency—and of those felt by the people through the neglect of the Church; of the grasping cupidity of commerce, which would even make merchandize of the souls of men; of the hard-hearted factory system, which treats living beings—men, women, and children—as if they were only the wheels and cogs of some vast machine, and mere bits of brass and iron; of the total heartlessness of fashion, condemning thousands of workmen to toil for months together with only four hours allowed for sleep, and often with none at all for two or three days together—thus sending hundreds of these victims of fashion every year to a premature grave. One of these cases, given on the evidence of Frederick Tyrrel, Esq., the eminent surgeon of St. Thomas's, is that of a girl of seventeen reduced to total blindness, and her general health materially deranged, from too close confinement and excessive work.

“ ‘She stated that she had been compelled to remain without changing her dress for nine days and nights consecutively; that during this period she had been permitted only occasionally to rest, upon a mattress placed on the floor, for an hour or two at a time; and that her meals were placed at her side and cut up, so that as little time as possible should be spent in their consumption.’ What a dread comment is this on the axiom of the apostle—‘the LOVE OF MONEY is the root of all evil!’ This is not the place for a full exposure of this merciless warfare carried on by commercial avarice against the temporal and eternal welfare of the youth of England. Suffice it to say, that in result it amounts to this: several millions of those for whom Christ died are held in horrible vassalage of body, soul, and conscience, by employers who call themselves Christians, in order to pamper the rich with unneeded luxuries, and to surfeit themselves with unrighteous gains.” (p. 253).

The consequences which must ensue, in righteous retribution, upon those who practice or encourage exactions such as these, it is appalling to contemplate; and they seem to be beyond the reach or control of any legislative interference, and can only be remedied by a better state of moral and religious feeling. And as the movement to which we are alluding has its deepest spring in religion, and the eyes of all men are turned towards the Church to see what will come of it, the clergy, who alone can deal with the evils, are confronted with them; and if they are to be remedied at all, it must be accomplished mainly through the clergy; if not remedied, the clergy will be among the first victims: but only among the first victims, for it is an "undeniable fact that our Church has ever been bound up with the solid glories, the substantial interests, and the permanent welfare of the empire." "And if the Church were overthrown, she would not be alone in her ruin; but around her prostrated temples and demolished shrines would lie scattered, in awful waste," all "those Christian homes where faith, hope, and charity now abound." (p. 314).

But the clergy, who are thus providentially, as we may say, constrained to take the foremost place, and who are themselves shaking to the very foundation by the vast and profound movement which is now heaving and fermenting beneath our feet, must make themselves acquainted with the dangers which they have to meet, and the true way of meeting them. And they cannot be long to seek in either of these—the dangers are so obvious, and they can only be met *in God's way*—the way of fearlessness, uncompromising truth and charity. The whole of this part of the subject is very well handled by Mr. Montgomery, but we must refer our readers to his book for the various aspects of this ecclesiastical movement, being only able to present to notice one feature, as developed in that portion of the Church which has been called **THE OXFORD PARTY**, but which Mr. Montgomery denominates **THE ROMANISTIC PARTY**. And this we notice, because the question is put in a very original and striking way; and because the principles laid down, like all true principles, apply to all similar cases, and are not got up for this case alone. Two introductory propositions are maintained as applying to the whole controversy up to this very hour:—"1. *The principle on which the Romanistic party proceeded from the beginning was unsound.* 2. *The prevailing spirit in which by far the greater portion of this controversy has been conducted is one which Christianity and the Church, as such, utterly condemn.*"

On the first proposition, that the principle was unsound, it is observed:—

"Let us even grant their own sentiments, touching the degeneracy of our Church, to be quite correct, and still we maintain that the plan they pursued, in seeking to restore her energies and recall her dignities, was altogether founded upon a shallow view of human nature and the real state of the case. Their method obviously was this :—Things are come to a desperate pass, and tend to a direful corruption ; we must therefore exterminate extremes by extremes ; apply certain doctrinal opposites to repulse opposites ; put contrasts to battle against contrasts, and formalism to annihilate fanaticism ; and thus carry on a warfare of denunciation and contradiction, till we have established our dogmas and doctrines on the ruins of sectarian errors and schismatics. But history, reason, common sense, the modes of providential government, the moral constitution of humanity, and the positive records of a suffering Church—all might have taught these Romanistic leaders a wiser lesson. They utterly forget that no form of human manifestation, worthy the epithet RELIGIOUS has been UTTERLY and ABSOLUTELY a lie ; and that therefore a mere denunciation of what we condemn, without a previous and benevolent desire to detect the *distorted truths*, or *exaggerated facts*, or *isolated principles*, on which sectarian enthusiasm so often is founded, could never succeed in those quarters where success was most required." (p. 330).

And concerning the spirit manifested by them it is observed—

"The WISDOM which is from ABOVE is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy. Such is the description of that wisdom which men who professed to deliver the Church from errors, misconceptions, and difficulties, ought to have exhibited. But, on the contrary, the mode in which some Tractarian Romanists have carried on their warfare has been by the wisdom which is from BELOW—where envying and strife is, and every evil work. (James, iii. 16). PARTY, more than TRUTH, has obviously reigned over them and their writings ; and the consequence is, that sarcasm, irony, insulting censures, damnatory severities, mingled with bitter sneers and scoffs at all who oppose them, abound in their productions. As a specimen of that tone, which must be as abhorrent to God as it is at utter variance with the meekness and mildness of the spiritual character, we refer to those savage outrages, under the shelter of an anonymous disguise, which appeared in the defunct *British Critic*, on Dr. Fawcett and the Tamworth reading-room. Men whose hearts could overflow with gall and be filled with wormwood, such as these articles betrayed, are *morally incapacitated* from handling the cause of God's truth : it is all too holy and heavenly an element for rancour and intemperance to appreciate or understand." (p. 332).

With these introductory propositions, the principal features of the Romanistic party are sketched as follows :—

"1. They depreciate the REFORMERS and the principles of the REFORMATION. 2. They repudiate and reject the name of PROTESTANTS. 3. They palliate the enormities and eulogize the character of the PAPAL CHURCH. 4. They PERSONIFY THE SACRAMENTS into a kind of mystical CHRIST ; imprison the HOLY GHOST in certain absolute rites,

cercmonics, and FORMS; put an ill-defined and ambiguous TRADITION in parallel influence, and sometimes paramount authority, over the simplicities of the DIVINE WORD;.....and a paricidal spirit of treason and disloyalty to our mother Church discovers itself whenever they allude to the protesting elements of the Reformation in England, with regard to purgatory, the Virgin Mary, transubstantiation, and praying for the dead. 5. There are yet three remaining characteristics which distinguish the Romanistic party:—First, the promised GUIDANCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT is treated either with studied NEGLECT, or, when introduced into discussion, is so confounded with fanaticism, folly, and presumption, as to leave an ignorant reader almost to doubt whether there be ANY HOLY GHOST AT ALL. In the second place, they exalt one divine ordinance *in order to depress another*: we allude especially to their pompous anathemas and lofty denunciations against PREACHING, in order to magnify PRAYER. Thirdly, and in conclusion, the rationalistic spirit in which our Anglican Romanists have often treated THE BIBLE has been scarcely surpassed by the Socinian heretics themselves." (pp. 337-352).

These characteristics of the party are substantiated by sufficient extracts from their acknowledged publications, or from periodicals notoriously under their influence and control, or bearing the obvious stamp of proceeding from the same school. But Mr. Montgomery pointedly excepts Dr. Pusey, and the older and more respectable heads of the party, from the disgrace attaching to the authorship of some of the extracts which are given. These are to be attributed to very young men, and upon them the shame must rest of the conceit, ignorance, and bigotry which the authors may have manifested as individuals. But many of these things, though chargeable on the persons who wrote them, are indicative of a spirit common to the whole party; and not only Mr. Montgomery, but every candid observer of this movement, have made it a constant theme of lamentation, that none of these gentlemen at all knew "the spirit they are of;" the leaders prove that they knew it not, in their now disclaiming the publications of their indiscreet and pert followers, though what they publish is the exposition of that same spirit—is but the legitimate, though it may be the precocious and unexpected, fruit of that seed which Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman have themselves sown.

And we are bound, in charity, to believe that none of the leaders of the movement were aware, when they first began, whither it would ultimately lead them; many, who, like Mr. Palmer, have been conscientiously obliged to stop or to retrace their steps, have plainly told us so; and it is quite evident that those who have not been awakened to discern whither they were being dragged, and have not had manliness enough and vigour enough to disentangle themselves from the eddies of that whirlpool which was ever drawing them nearer and nearer

to the gulf, are become well nigh infatuated, and seem past recovery, and about to plunge headlong into an abyss of hopelessness. For the case of one who has known the truths of the Reformation, falling back into the errors of Popery, is far worse than that of one who has never known the truth—it is the dog returning to its vomit, or the sow to her wallowing in the mire; nay, it is opening the door to an unclean spirit to re-enter a house from whence he has been expelled, when, finding it swept and garnished, he brings in seven other spirits worse than himself; and the last state of that man is worse than the first. Some of their expressions place us in the dilemma of being constrained to think that they are given over to the imbecility of folly, or to the guilt of daring blasphemy: what else can we make of such a passage as the following?—

“In the gifts promised to the apostles after the resurrection, we may learn the present influence and power of the mother of God.” (*Newman*, pp. 42, 43). “One has no heart to comment on an exhibition so melancholy, so humiliating as this passage presents to the mind. And can comment be anything but superfluous?” (*Montgomery*, p. 360).

The space we have devoted to this volume, and the copious extracts which we have made, show the sense we entertain of its importance and value; and we trust that it will find such acceptance with the public as will encourage Mr. Montgomery to go on, that it may be but the forerunner of others still more complete and perfect. It cannot but be so, if, as we hope, he will go on; for he himself will discover the necessity of more condensation of matter, and of greater simplicity of style, in such momentous and all-engrossing subjects. And we would press this upon him, not only as to language and forms of expression, but also as to the choice of his imagery and metaphors—to take care that they are, in the first place, becoming the subject, and, in the next place, that they are homogeneous, and quite in congruity with each other. For instance, in a passage which we have in part extracted, “public religion, national morality, private virtue,” &c., which are abstractions, are supposed to “lie scattered, in awful waste, around prostrated temples and demolished shrines,” which are realities, though metaphorical. These things we only allude to thus briefly in hopes of seeing them amended; and should not notice them at all were we not assured that there is strength enough in the writer not only to bear having them pointed out, but to set himself vigorously to overcome them. And to ourselves they are not at all serious blots, and have not interfered in the least with the pleasure we have experienced in the perusal of this volume. Though unknown to Mr. Montgomery, we render him our thanks, and bid him God-speed on his onward course, and hope to meet him soon again.

ART. VI.—*Lettre Encyclique du Pape Gregoire XVI.* "Archives du Christianisme," No. XI., Juin 8. 1844. Paris.

2. *Circular Letter from his Holiness the Pope.* The "English Churchman," June 20th, 1844.
3. *Declaration of the [Roman] Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Coadjutors in Great Britain.* London. 1843. 8vo.
4. *A Brief Reply to the Declaration of the [Roman] Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic, and their Coadjutors in Great Britain.* Ashby-de-la-Zouch: Hextall. London: Sherwood and Co. 1843. 12mo.

IF there be one fact more notorious than another in the practice of the Romish Church, it is the sedulous and incessant care with which—in all countries where Popery is dominant—her bishops and priests keep the holy Scriptures from the people. Where, however, Papists live in society with Protestants, they would gladly conceal this fact, if it were possible; and they spare no pains to cause it to be believed, that their section of the universal Church never withheld the Bible from the people. Hence the Romish "bishops, and vicars apostolic, and their coadjutors in Great Britain," in their "Declaration," which was first published in 1826, and which has recently been re-printed,* complain that "they are still exhibited to the public.....as enemies to the circulation and to the reading of the holy Scriptures (Preamble, p. 4); and that "the Catholic" [Romish] "Church is held out as an enemy to the reading and circulating of the holy Scriptures." (Sect. 3, p. 7). How justly that Church is so "held out" (even if we had not abundance of historical evidence to prove the fact), will be evident from the vehement denunciations of the present Pope, Gregory XVI., in his Encyclical Letter, against an association instituted (as he states) at New York, called the "Christian League;" which was

* The mis-statements of the "Declaration" of the Romish bishops, &c., were exposed and refuted by the Rev. Philip Alwood, in his "Brief Remarks," published in 1826; and paragraph by paragraph by the Rev. George Townsend, in his very able "review" of that pamphlet, published in 1827. The recent reprint of the "Declaration" called forth the "Brief Reply" and refutation, published by the Loughborough and Ashby-de-la-Zouch (Church of England) Protestant Tract Society, in 1843—a society which, with comparatively small means, we rejoice to say, has hitherto been eminently useful in the district which is within the sphere of its labours. This "Brief Reply" is admirably adapted for circulation, as an antidote to the "Declaration" of the Romish bishops.

formed for the express purpose of circulating "among Italians, and especially the Romans," what the Pope is pleased to term "corrupt and vulgar Bibles," together with Merle D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation," and Dr. McCrie's "History of the Reformation in Italy." If, indeed, we may judge of the success which, with the divine blessing, has attended the efforts made to circulate the unadulterated Scriptures on the continent, by the opposition which those efforts have excited, we have abundant cause for joy at the bitter hostility against the Bible, which breathes in almost every paragraph of the Pope's Encyclical Letter. The publication of it in the English journals is such an irrefragable evidence of the enmity of Rome to the circulation and reading of the Scriptures, that we are not at all surprised that English Romanists should have expressed "some displeasure" at the reprinting of it in this country. In the United States of America, the intolerant and arrogant tone of this papal epistle has excited only disgust and contempt.*

As this Encyclical Letter refers with approbation to the efforts of those pontiffs, his predecessors, who, in the plenitude of their usurped supremacy, denounced *all* Protestant versions of the Bible; we think (at least we, hope) that we shall render a service to the readers of our journal, by placing upon record some documentary evidence on this subject: and since Gregory XVI. has thought proper to charge Protestant versions with being "corrupt," we shall proceed to adduce some convincing testimonies, which will demonstrate, that where the Church of Rome cannot altogether prevent the holy Scriptures from being translated and circulated, she has made no scruple of falsifying the text.

One of the earliest proofs on record occurred in the year 1080. Wratislaus, Duke of Bohemia, had requested *Saint* Gregory VII. (better known by the name of Hildebrand†) to permit the celebration of divine service in the Sclavonian language, which was understood by his subjects. This reasonable

* In the *New York Weekly Herald*, of July 30, 1844, it is asserted that Gregory XVI. issued his letter at the solicitation of John Hughes, the Romish bishop at New York.

† The whole life of this man was one unceasing and unprincipled effort to realize the universal dominion of the world, which he claimed as an appendage to the see of Rome. Against his canonization, in the eighteenth century, by Benedict XIII., every government which at that time was in communion with Rome, protested, and rejected his saintship; so that he is acknowledged and venerated only at Rome and in Ireland.—*Bishop Phillips's Supplemental Letter to Charles Butler, Esq.*, pp. 145-150.

request was peremptorily refused by the haughty pontiff, on the pretext that the Almighty thought fit that holy Scripture should be concealed in some places, lest, if it should be accessible to all, it should fall into contempt, and, being misunderstood, should lead the people into error.*

In the year 1229, during the pontificate of Gregory IX., a council was held at Toulouse, in which, besides various enactments against those who were denounced as heretics, and also against those princes who did not extirpate all heretics out of their dominions, the laity are, by the thirteenth canon, prohibited from having the books of the Old or New Testament, unless any one, out of devotion, should wish to have a psalter, or a breviary for the divine offices, or the Hours of the Blessed Mary. *But THEY ARE MOST STRICTLY FORBIDDEN to have these books in the vulgar tongue.*†

This language cannot be misunderstood. The Romish theologians, who were convened at that council, assumed authority to deprive the people of that divine revelation which had been given to be "a light unto their feet, and a lamp unto their path." Not even such portions, as might be found in a psalter or breviary, were to be allowed, except in a dead language. And no wonder: "for every one that doeth evil hateth the light, and cometh not to the light, that his works be not re-proved." (Anglo-Romish version of John iii. 20). The Church of Rome shuns the light, and shrinks from a free comparison of her doctrines and practices with the only test which God has given of a true and pure Church.

Though calling itself an œcumenical or general council, that assembly was wholly composed of divines of the Roman obedience; and the histories of its proceedings prove that they were all regulated, either in pursuance of orders from Rome, or in conformity with the express wishes of the Popes. Its sittings commenced December 3rd, 1545, and were con-

* "Quia vero nobilitas tua postulavit, quòd secundum Sclavonicam linguam apud vos divinum celebrari annueremus officium; scias nos huic petitioni tuæ nequaquam posse favere. Ex hoc nempe sæpe volventibus liquet, non immerito sacram Scripturam omnipotenti Deo placuisse quibusdam locis esse occultam; ne si ad liquidum cunctis pateret, fortè vilesceret, et subjaceret despectui, aut prave intellecta à mediocribus in errorem induceret."—*Greg. VII.*, Epist. lib' vii. Ep. 11, in Cardinal Baronius's *Annales Ecclesiastici*, tom. 17, p. 496. Lucæ, 1745, fol.

† "Prohibemus, ne libros Veteris Testamenti aut Novi laici permittentur habere; nisi fortè psalterium, vel breviarium pro divinis officiis, aut Horas beatæ Mariæ, aliquis ex devotione habere velit. *Sed ne prætermittos libros habeant in vulgari lingua translatos ARCTISSIME INHIBEMUS.*"—*Iabbè et Cossart, Concilia*, tom. xi., part 1, col. 430.

tinued (with interruptions, caused by suspension and removal to Bologna, from March 25th, 1547, to September 1st, 1551,) until December 4th, 1563; thus completing a period of eighteen years, during which it was under the infallible direction of Paul III., Julius II., and Pius IV.*

In the eighteenth session of the Council of Trent, it was referred to a committee to prepare an index of prohibited books; but as they had not finished their labours at the close of the session, that business was entrusted to Pope Pius IV., under whose auspices the first index was published in 1564.† Ten rules are prefixed to this index, which are retained in all subsequent impressions of it. We extract a few passages, to show the rigour with which the Romish Church, like the pharisees of old, takes away the key of knowledge, by depriving the laity of the word of God:—

“**RULE IV.**—Inasmuch as it is manifest from experience, that if the holy Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it, it is, on this point, referred to the judgment of the bishops or inquisitors, who may, by the advice of the priest or confessor, permit the reading of the Bible, translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors, to those persons whose faith and piety, they apprehend, will be augmented, and not injured by it; and this permission they must have in writing. But if any one shall have the presumption to read or possess it without such written permission, he shall not receive absolution until he have first delivered up such Bible to the ordinary. Booksellers, however, who shall sell or otherwise dispose of Bibles in the vulgar tongue, to any person not having such permission, shall forfeit the value of the books, to be applied by the bishop to some pious use; and be subjected to such other penalties as the bishop shall judge proper, according to the quality of the offence. But regulars shall neither read nor purchase such Bibles without a special licence from their superiors.”‡

* An accurate analysis of the proceedings of each session of the Tridentine assembly will be found in the Rev. J. Mendham's "Memoirs of the Council of Trent, principally derived from manuscript and unpublished Records." London, 1834, 8vo.

† A full account of the expurgatory and prohibitory indexes of the Romish Church will be found in Mr. Mendham's "Literary Policy of the Church of Rome, exhibited in an Account of her Damnable Catalogues or Indexes;" (second edition, London, 1830. 8vo.); and in his "Index of Prohibited Books by command of the present Pope, Gregory XVI., in 1835. London, 1840." 8vo. We may add, that another edition of the Roman Index (from which our quotations are made) was published at Rome in 1841.

‡ "REGULA IV.—Cum experimento manifestum est, si sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri; hac in parte judicio episcopi aut inquisitoris stetur, ut cum consilio parochi, aut confessarii, Bibliorum a catholicis aucto-

That part of the preceding rule, which allowed "the reading of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue by Catholic authors," was qualified by the following proviso of Benedict XIV.: "But if versions of this kind of books in the vulgar tongue are approved by the apostolic see, or are edited with annotations drawn from the holy fathers of the Church, or from learned and Catholic men, they are allowed."* Liberal, however, as this proviso *seems*, real effect it has none. The slightest reflection upon its conditions will at once convince the reader that, though it might suit the pontiff to make a demonstration of the semblance of liberality, yet the reins were kept in his hands as effectually as ever. Let any unwelcome application be made for a license; and here are the conditions as strait, as numerous, and as dependent on interpretation as could be desired. No such thing as the simple word of God, "which is able to make us wise unto salvation," is to be permitted!

"RULE VII.—Books professedly treating of lascivious or obscene subjects, or narrating or teaching them, are utterly prohibited; and those who possess them shall be severely punished by the bishop. *But works of antiquity, written by the heathens, are permitted to be read, on account of the elegance and propriety of the language; though on no account shall they be suffered to be read by young persons.*"†

The reader will not fail to observe the easy virtue of Rome in thus giving permission for the reading of "obscene works of antiquity, on account of the elegance and propriety of the language;" while the infinitely purer morality of the Scriptures is prohibited to be read, because, forsooth, if "the holy Bible,

ribus versorum lectionem in vulgari lingua eis concedere possit, quos intellexerint ex hujusmodi lectione non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum, capere posse; quam facultatem in scriptis habeant.

"Qui autem absque tali facultate ea legere, aut habere præsumpserit, nisi prius Bibliis ordinario redditus, peccatorum absolutionem percipere non possit.

"Bibliopola vero, qui prædictam facultatem non habenti Biblia idiomate vulgari conscripta vendiderint, vel alio quovis modo concesserint, librorum pretium, in usus pios ab episcopo convertendum, amittant; aliisque poenis pro delicti qualitate, ejusdem episcopi arbitrio, subjaceant. Regulares vero, non nisi facultate a praelatis suis habita, ea legere aut emere possint."—Page x. of "Index Librorum Prohibitorum sanctissimi Domini nostri Gregorij XVI. Pontificis Maximi jussu editus. Romæ, MDCCCLXII. Ex Typographia Reverendæ Cameræ Apostolicæ. Cum Summi Pontificis privilegio." 8vo.

* "Quodsi hujusmodi librorum versiones vulgari lingua fuerint ab apostolica sede approbatæ, aut editæ cum annotationibus desumptis ex sanctis ecclesiæ patribus, vel ex doctis catholicisque viris, conceduntur. *Decret. Sac. Congregationis Ind. 13 Junii, 1757.*" (Index Librorum Prohibitorum, p. xv. Romæ. 1841).

† "REGULA VII.—Libri qui res lascivas seu obscenas ex professo tractant, omnino prohibentur; et qui eos habuerint severe ab episcopis puniantur. Antiqui vero, ab ethnicis conscripti, propter sermonis elegantiam et proprietatem, permittantur: nulla tamen ratione pueris prælegendierunt." (*Ibid.* p. xi.)

translated into the vulgar tongue, be indiscriminately allowed to every one, the temerity of men will cause more evil than good to arise from it!!!” With as much reason might men be prohibited from eating or drinking, for fear they should abuse that liberty.

“ Finally, it is enjoined on all the faithful, that no one presume to keep or read any books contrary to these rules, or prohibited by this index. But if any one read or keep any books composed by heretics, or the writings of any author suspected of heresy; or false doctrine, he shall instantly incur the sentence of excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted on another account, besides the mortal sin committed, shall be severely punished at the will of the bishops.”*

In addition to the ten rules of the index, from which the preceding passages are cited, there are decrees respecting prohibited books, not specially named in the index. In these decrees, besides forms of prayer, calendars, martyrologies, necrologies, poems, catechisms, and other elementary tracts on the doctrines of the Reformed or Protestant Churches, it is ordered that, “all *Bibles* printed by Protestants, or enlarged by them with notes, arguments, summaries, scholia, and indexes,” and also “metrical versions of the Bible and parts thereof,” are to be reckoned among prohibited books.†

Such is the universal law of the Romish Church in prohibiting the reading of the holy Scriptures: and how steadily she continues to act upon it, will be manifest from a brief review of the bulls and encyclical (or circular) letters of later Popes.

In the year 1671 the learned and pious Jansenist, Pasquier Quesnel, published a French translation of the New Testament, accompanied with excellent devout and practical annotations, which passed through numerous editions. Alarmed at the success of this work, which had produced a change in the minds of many in favour of the doctrines of Jansenius, the Jesuits prevailed on Louis XIV. to solicit its condemna-

* “Ad extremum vero omnibus fidelibus præcipitur, ne quis audeat contra harum regulatum præscriptum, aut hujus indicis prohibitionem, libros aliquos legere aut habere.

“Quod si quis libros hæreticorum, vel hujus auctoris scripta, ob hæresim, vel ob falsi dogmatis suspicionem damnata, atque prohibita, legerit, sive habuerit, statim in excommunicationis sententiam incurrat.

“Qui vero libros alio nomine interdictos legerit, aut habuerit, præter peccati mortalis reatum, quo afficitur, judicio episcoporum severe puniatur.” (*Ibid*, p. xiv.)

† “3. *Biblia sacra eorum opera impressa, vel eorundem annotationibus argumentis, summariis, scholiis et indicibus aucta.*

“4. *Biblia sacra et eorum partes ab eodem metricè conscripta.*” (*Ibid*, p. xli.)

tion at the Court of Rome. Accordingly, Pope Clement XI. on the 8th of September, 1713, issued the famous bull or constitution *Unigenitus** (so called from the first three words, "*Unigenitus Dei filius*"); in which Quesnel's New Testament was condemned, and one hundred and one propositions extracted from the notes were selected for condemnation. The six following relate to the reading of the Scriptures:—

80. "The reading of the sacred Scripture is for all.

81. "The obscurity of the sacred word of God is no reason for laymen to dispense themselves from reading it.

82. "The Lord's day ought to be sanctified by Christians for reading works of piety, and, above all, of the sacred Scriptures. It is damnable to wish to withdraw a Christian from this reading.

83. "It is an illusion to persuade oneself that a knowledge of the mysteries of religion is not to be communicated to women by the reading of the sacred book. Not from the simplicity of women, but from the proud science of men, has the abuse of the Scriptures arisen, and heresies have been produced.

84. "To take away the New Testament from the hands of Christians, or to shut it up from them, by taking from them the means of understanding it, is to close the mouth of Christ to them.

85. "To interdict from Christians the reading of the sacred Scripture, particularly of the Gospel, is to interdict the use of the light from the sons of light, and to cause that they should suffer some species of excommunication."†

Any candid reader would conclude that the doctrine comprised in these propositions was in perfect accordance with the letter and spirit of the Gospel. They were, however, condemned by the Pope, and all persons were prohibited, on pain of ecclesiastical censures and other punishments, from teaching, de-

* Mosheim Eccl. His. Cent. 18, § x. vol. vi. p. 12.

† 80. "Lectio sacræ Scripturæ est pro omnibus.

81. "Obscuritas sancti verbi Dei, non est laicis ratio dispensandi seipsos ab ejus lectione.

82. "Dies Dominicus a Christianis debet sanctificari lectionibus pietatis, et super omnia sanctorum Scripturarum. Damnosum est velle Christianum ab hac lectione retrahere.

83. "Est illusio sibi persuadere, quòd notitia mysteriorum religionis non debeat communicari fœminis lectione sacrarum Librorum. Non ex fœminarum simplicitate, sed ex superba virorum scientia ortus est Scripturarum abusus, et natæ sunt hæreses.

84. "Abripere è Christianorum manibus novum Testamentum, seu eis illud clausum tenere, auferendo eis modum illud intelligendi, est illis Christi os obturare.

85. "Interdicere Christianis lectionem sacræ Scripturæ præsertim Evangelii, est interdicere usum luminis filiis lucis, et facere ut patiantur speciem quandam excommunicationis."—*Cocquelines, Bullarium*, Tom. xi. Pars i., p. 343, col. 2. Romæ, 1735, folio.

fending, or publishing them, or even to treat of them in disputation, publicly or privately, unless it were to impugn them. This bull affords a full and satisfactory answer to the false assertions of Romanists, that the Scriptures are not shut up from the people. In most of the states and kingdoms of the Roman obedience it was submissively received: at first, indeed, it met with great opposition in France; but at length the majority of the Gallican clergy received it, and finally it was confirmed by a royal ordinance. *It is in full force in Ireland.**

Ninety years after the issuing of this bull, the British and Foreign Bible Society was instituted at London, in 1804, for the single and benevolent object of promoting a wider circulation of the holy Scriptures, without note or comment, in the British dominions, as well as in other countries, whether Christian, Mohammedan, or Pagan; and its proceedings, as might be expected, called forth the bitter denunciations of successive Roman Pontiffs.*

Pius VII. first issued a rescript to the Archbishop of Gnesn, primate of Poland, dated June 29, 1816: in which he denounced the circulation of the unadulterated Scriptures of truth, without note or comment, as a "crafty device by which the foundations of religion are undermined," and a "defilement of the faith most imminently dangerous to souls." Having exhorted the archbishop to execute with the utmost earnestness whatever he can achieve by power, provide for by counsel, or effect by authority, to prevent the circulation of the Scriptures, Pius VII. reminds him of his episcopal duty, first of all, to expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme (the circulation of the Bible) to the view of the faithful:—

"And openly to publish the same, according to the rules prescribed by the Church, with all that erudition and wisdom in which you excel; namely, 'That Bibles printed by heretics are numbered among prohibited books, agreeably to the rules of the Index (No. II. and III.); for it is evident from experience, that the holy Scriptures, when published in the vulgar tongue, have, through the temerity of men, produced more harm than benefit;' (Rule IV.) And this is the rather to be dreaded in times so depraved, when our holy religion is assailed from every quarter with great cunning and effort, and the most grievous wounds are inflicted on the Church. It is, therefore, necessary to adhere to the salutary decree of the congregation of the Index (June 13th, 1757); that no versions of the Bible in the vulgar tongue be permitted,

* Evidence of Dr. Murray, the titular Romish Archbishop of Dublin, before the House of Commons in 1825. (Report, p. 647).

except such as are approved by the Apostolic See, or published with annotations extracted from the writings of the holy fathers of the Church." *

Not many months after the date of the preceding rescript, the same pontiff, on the 3rd of September, 1816, addressed an objurgatory Brief to the Archbishop of Mohileff or Mohilow, the Romish metropolitan of Russia, who had been guilty of the heinous crime (heinous in the judgment of Rome) of authorizing and exhorting the people committed to his care to procure modern versions of the Scriptures, or to accept them when offered, and attentively to peruse them. In this Brief, Pius VII. tells him that he ought to have kept in view what preceding Popes had always prescribed, viz. "That if the holy Bible in the vulgar tongue was permitted everywhere without discrimination, more injury than benefit would thence arise."

After reciting the constitutions of his predecessors, and particularly the constitution "Unigenitus," and further reprehending the good prelate for omitting to enforce the traditions of the Church, Pius VII. concludes his denunciation of the Bible by telling him that he "should sincerely and plainly teach that the Christian faith and doctrine, as well dogmatical as moral, are contained not in the Scriptures only, but also in the traditions of the Catholic Church; and that it belongs to the Church herself alone to interpret each of them." †

In 1824, on the accession of Leo XII. to the pontificate, he issued an Encyclical Letter to all the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, of the Roman obedience, dated May 3rd; in which he urges them, by all means in their power, to keep the people from reading the Scriptures; and further gives his sanction to the bulls of his predecessors against the circulation and reading of the Word of God, which he audaciously termed the "gospel of the devil."

"You are not ignorant," he says, "venerable brethren, that a society, commonly called the *Bible Society*, is boldly stalking throughout the world; which, contemning the traditions of the holy fathers, and contrary to the well-known decree of the Council of Trent, is lending all its strength, and by every means, to translate the Bible in the vulgar languages of all nations, or rather to pervert it. Whence it is greatly to be feared lest, as in some versions already known, so also in others, by a perverse interpretation, instead of the Gospel of Christ, it should become the gospel of man, or, what is worse, the gospel of the devil.

* Blair's Letters on the "Revival of Popery," pp. 129, 130.

† Ibid., pp. 132-136. The entire brief of Pope Pius VII. is printed in pp. 131-137.

"Many of our predecessors have issued constitutions for the averting of this pest; and, in these last times, Pius VII., of holy memory, sent two briefs, one to Ignatius, Archbishop of Gnesn, and to Stanislaus, Archbishop of Mohilow: in which are found many things both accurately and wisely extracted from the divine Scriptures and from tradition, to show how noxious this very crafty invention is to faith and morals.

"We also, venerable brethren, in the discharge of our apostolical office, exhort you to remove your flocks, by every means, from these deadly pastures. Reprove, beseech, be instant in season and out of season, in all patience and doctrine, that your faithful [souls], adhering strictly to the rules of our congregation of the Index, may persuade themselves that, if the holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be indiscriminately permitted everywhere, more good than evil will arise from it, in consequence of the temerity of men."*

The latest fulmination against the Scriptures was hurled by the present Pontiff, Gregory XVI., in a bull dated so recently as the day after the nones of May (that is, May 8th), 1844. Having denounced the circulation of the Scriptures by the Bible Societies, and referred to the decrees of the Council of Trent, as well as to the prohibitions of preceding Popes against reading the Scriptures, concluding with the Encyclical Letter of Leo XII. last cited, he thus proceeds:—

"Shortly afterwards, our immediate predecessor, Pius VIII., of happy memory, confirmed their condemnation by his circular letter of May 24, 1829. We, in short, who succeeded them, notwithstanding our great unworthiness, have not ceased to be solicitous on this subject, and have especially studied to bring to the recollection of the faithful the several rules which have been successively laid down with regard to the vulgar versions of the holy books."†

The Christian League, at New York, is next denounced in no measured terms: and all the decrees of preceding Popes

* "Non vos latet, VV. FF., societatem quandam, dictam vulgò *biblicam*, per totum orbem audacter vagari, quæ spreto SS. Patrum traditionibus, et contra notissimum Tridentini concilii decretum, in id collatis viribus ac modis omnibus intendit, ut in vulgares linguas nationum omnium sacra vertantur, vel potius pervertantur Biblia. Ex quo valde pertimescendum est, ne, sicut in aliquibus jam notis, ita et in cæteris interpretatione perversâ de Evangelio Christi hominis fiat Evangelium, aut, quod pejus est, diaboli.

"Nos quoque pro apostolico nostro munere hortamur vos, VV. FF., ut gregem vestrum a lethiferis hisce pascuis amovere omnimodè satagatis. Arguite, obsecrate, instate opportune, importune, in omni patientia, et doctrina, ut fideles vestri regulis nostræ Indicis congregationis adamussim inherentes sibi persuadeant, si sacra Biblia vulgari linguâ passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde ob hominum temeritatem detrimenti quàm utilitatis oriri."—*Lettre Encyclique de Notre Saint Père le Pape Leon XII.* Paris: Chez Adrian Le Clerc, imprimeur de N. S. P. le Pape, &c. 1824. pp. 20, 22.

† Encyclical Letter of Gregory XVI. in the *English Churchman*, of June 20, 1844, p. 380.

against the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue are declared to be confirmed and renewed :—

“Many precise advices and documents teach us that a vast number of members of sects in New York, in America, at one of their meetings, held on the 4th of June, last year, have formed a new association, which will take the name of the ‘Christian League (Fœderis Christiani)’—a league composed of individuals of every nation, and which is to be further increased in numbers by other auxiliary societies, all having the same object, viz., to propagate amongst Italians, and especially Romans, the principles of Christian liberty, or rather an insane indifference to all religion. These, indeed, confess that the Roman institutions, as well as Italian, had, in by-gone times, so much influence that nothing great was done in the world but had its origin in our august city. Not that they ascribe the fact to the Pontifical See, which was then founded by the disposition of God himself, but verily to some remains of the old Roman power, subsequently usurped, as they say, by our predecessors, who succeeded to that power.

“This is why, determined to afford to all people liberty of conscience (or rather, it should be said, liberty to err), from which, according to their theory, must flow, as from an inexhaustible source, public prosperity and political liberty, they think they should, before all things, win over the inhabitants of Rome and Italy, in order to avail themselves afterwards of their example and aid in regard to other countries.

“They hope to attain this result easily by favour of the Italians scattered over the world. They flatter themselves that on returning in large numbers to their country, and bearing with them whether the exaltation of novelty, corruption of manners, or the excitement of want, they would hardly hesitate to affiliate themselves to the League, and at least second it through venality. This society strains every nerve to introduce amongst them, by means of individuals collected from all parts, corrupt and vulgar Bibles, and to scatter them secretly amongst the faithful. At the same time, their intention is to disseminate worse books still, or tracts designed to withdraw from the minds of their readers all respect for the Church and the Holy See. These books and tracts have been composed in Italian, or translated into Italian from other languages, with the aid of Italians themselves; and amongst these books should be particularly cited ‘The History of the Reformation,’ by Merle d’Aubigny, and ‘Calendar of the Reformation in Italy’ (‘*Fastes de la Réforme en Italie,*’) by Jean Cric,* that is M’Crie.”†

* * * * *

“Scarcely were we made aware of these facts but we were pro-

* Encyclical Letter of Gregory XVI. in the *English Churchman*, of June 20, 1844, p. 386.

† In the Index of Prohibited Books, Dr. M’Crie’s name is somewhat more accurately printed :—“Maccie, Thomas. *Istoria del Progresso e dell’Estinzione delle Riforme in Italia, nel secolo sedicesimo, tradotto dall’Inglese.* Decr. 22, *Septembris* 1, 1836.”—*Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, p. 235, Rome, 1841.

foundly grieved on reflecting upon the danger which threatened, not only remote countries, but the very centre of unity itself; and we have been anxious to defend religion against the like manœuvres. * * *

"Wherefore, having consulted some of the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, after having duly examined with them everything, and listened to their advice, we have decided, venerable brothers, on addressing you this letter, by which we again condemn the Bible Societies, reprov'd long ago by our predecessors; and by virtue of the supreme authority of our apostleship, we reprove by name and condemn the aforesaid society called the Christian League, formed last year at New York, together with every other society associated with it, or which may become so.

"Let all know, then, the enormity of the sin against God and the Church, which they are guilty of, who dare to associate themselves with any of these societies, or abet them in any way. Moreover, we confirm and renew the decrees recited above, delivered in former times by apostolic authority, against the publication, distribution, reading, and possession of books of the holy Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue. With reference to the works of whatsoever writer, we call to mind the observance of the general rules and decrees of our predecessors, to be found prefixed to the *Index* of prohibited books; and we invite the faithful to be upon their guard, not only against the books named in the *Index*, but also against those comprised in the general prescriptions.

"As for yourselves, my venerable brethren, called as you are to divide our solicitude, we recommend you earnestly in the Lord to announce and proclaim, in convenient time and place, to the people confided to your care, these apostolic orders, and to labour carefully to separate the faithful sheep from the contagion of the Christian League—from those who have become its auxiliaries, no less than those who belong to other Bible Societies, and from all who have any communication with them. *You are consequently enjoined to REMOVE from the hands of the faithful alike the Bibles, in the vulgar tongue, which may have been printed contrary to the decrees above-mentioned of the Sovereign Pontiffs, and every book proscribed and condemned, and to see that they learn, through your admonition and authority, what pasturages are salutary, and what pernicious and mortal.*"*

We are not surprised that M. Merle d'Aubigné's "*History of the Reformation*," and Dr. McCrie's "*History of the Reformation in Italy*," should be thus honoured with the bitter denunciations of Gregory XVI., by whom they have been proscribed and condemned; for they contain such a development of the principles and proceedings of the Romish Church; and Dr. McCrie's *History*, in particular, contains such a delineation of the atrocious means resorted to for the extinction of the Reformation—that is, of pure and undefiled religion—in Italy; as

* Encyclical Letter, *English Churchman*, p. 386.

would most completely open the eyes of the Italians generally, and especially of the "citizens of his own city," to the unscriptural and antiscritptural tenets and practices of the Popes and of Papal emissaries and agents. Unable to refute the statements of those historians, who have based their narratives upon indisputable authorities and documents, Gregory XVI. has denounced and prohibited them: just as his predecessors, Alexander VIII. and Innocent XII., prohibited Bishop Burnet's "History of the Reformation in England,"* in which we have such important details respecting the abominations of Popery at the time the Reformation commenced in this country, and also of the cruelties perpetrated on the defenceless Protestants during the sanguinary reign of Mary.

To the authoritative declarations of successive Popes, above given, against the circulation and free reading of the Scriptures, we feel that it is perfectly unnecessary for us to add a single reflection. They breathe, throughout, a determined and unmitigated spirit of hatred to the Bible; and no wonder—"for if the blessed truths of that divine book were once to become familiar to the ears and hearts of the poor, to whom that Gospel was preached, they would soon find out that they had long been following blind guides, who have made the commandment of God of non effect by their vain traditions." Where, however, the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue are in the hands of a "people who know the joyful sound" of the Gospel, and who are devoutly grateful for that inestimable boon; there the emissaries of Popery *cannot* make any progress in proselyting. Of this important and delightful fact we have a signal illustration in the very ancient (we might say, primitive) Church of the Vaudois, and in the modern Christians of the island of Tahiti. The Vaudois have, all along, had the Scriptures in their hands. It was one of the charges made against them by their sanguinary Popish persecutors in the twelfth century, that they held that the text of the sacred Scriptures is to be received and believed in opposition to human traditions and comments. To the Vaudois were the Protestants of France indebted for the first French version of the Bible, (generally called "Olivetan's Bible," from the name of its ostensible translator,) which bears the date of 1535, and which was printed at their expense. And, notwithstanding the many centuries of persecution and oppression which the Vaudois have endured, their venerable Church—like the bush

* "Burnet Gilbert. Histoire de la Reformation de l'Eglise d'Angleterre, traduit de l'Anglois par M. de Rosemond, Decr. 20 Mai, 1690, et 21 Apr. 1693. —Index Librorum Prohibitorum. p. 68, Rome, 1841.

on the rock of Horeb—still subsists, burning, yet unconsumed. In the island of Tahiti, through the divine blessing upon the labours of the missionaries of the London Missionary Society, the inhabitants, having experienced “the Gospel” to be “the power of God unto salvation,”—thirty years since renounced idolatry, with all its attendant abominations: and, having received from the missionaries the precious gift of the holy Scriptures in their native language, they have continued, and still continue, steadfast in the faith of Christ, unmoved by the seductive efforts of the Jesuit missionaries of Rome, who accompanied the French, when they illegally possessed themselves of the island of Tahiti in the year 1842.

We will now direct the attention of our readers to a few of the practical results of all these Papal denunciations against the unadulterated and canonical books of the holy Scriptures, which Leo XII. audaciously termed “deadly pastures,” and “the gospel of the devil.”

At the present day, indeed, in Protestant countries where the sacerdotal despotism of Rome is held in check, the fourth rule of the Index of Prohibited Books, on which (as our readers will have seen) so many pontiffs dwell with fond delight, is not and cannot be enforced to the very letter; but wherever Popery is absolutely dominant, the free circulation of the Bible is prohibited, and consequently the great mass of the people are destitute of the Word of Life.

In all the dominions of the Emperor of AUSTRIA, for instance, Bibles—whether in Hebrew or in the vulgar tongue—are prohibited with such inflexible rigour, that, in 1839, when two members of the deputation from the Church of Scotland arrived at Brody, in Austrian Poland, on a benevolent mission of enquiry into the religious and moral condition of the Jews, every book, in whatever language, was taken from them, “*even (they state) our Hebrew and English Bibles*”; and we were left the alternative of allowing them to be sent to Lemberg, to be examined by the censor there, and waiting for his opinion of their orthodoxy, or of at once allowing ourselves to be deprived of their use, until we should be beyond the dominions of Austria. On our preferring the latter alternative, they agreed to seal up our books in a parcel, and send them on to Cracow, to await our arrival. When we pleaded to be allowed to retain our *English Bibles*, the only answer we received was, “*It is not allowed in Austria.*”^{*} It was from the Austrian

^{*} “Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews from the Church of Scotland in 1839,” p. 458. Edinburgh, 1844.

province of Tyrol that six hundred Protestant Tyrolese were compelled to expatriate themselves in 1837, having been led to renounce the errors of Popery by the reading of the Bible and other religious books which had been carried into that country.*

In FRANCE, recourse has, on various occasions, been had to the pulpit and the press, for the purpose of decrying the object and misrepresenting the motives of those who are employed in the benevolent work of circulating the holy Scriptures; but the reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society contain most gratifying intelligence that "the word of God is not bound." Not merely are individuals, but in many instances whole villages are renouncing the errors of Popery; and the annually increasing diffusion of the Bible in that country only attests the futile hostility of the emissaries of Rome.

In BELGIUM, every opposition which can well be conceived has for many years been made to the circulation of the holy Scriptures. The persons employed have been not merely reproached, insulted, and threatened, but mobs have been instigated to maltreat and injure them. Their books have been stolen or forcibly taken away, and some of them even torn to pieces or burnt before their eyes. Yet they have persevered in the prosecution of their labours of Christian love; and not unfrequently have they been indebted for their personal safety to the presence and interference of the civil, and sometimes of the military, authorities.† It is not surprising that persons of inferior rank should look on this good work with an evil eye, when a prelate of the Romish Church in that country, the Bishop of Bruges,‡ hesitates not to describe and denounce the British and Foreign Bible Society as "a society *hostile to God* and to the holy Church"—a society which would rob "his dear brethren of all that is most dear to them." Citing the Encyclical Letter of Leo XII. above quoted, the bishop proceeds to characterize the circulation of the unmutated Scriptures as "the impious project of this anti-christian society, by which the world is inundated with heretical Bibles.....in which the perfidy of heretics has carried sacrilegious temerity to such an extent, as shamefully to mutilate the book of Daniel; nay, even to cut out whole books, as those of Tobit, Judith, the

* The Zillerthalers, who had endured every possible annoyance and vexation from the Popish clergy for several years, found a hospitable asylum in the dominions of the King of Prussia, at Erdmannsdorf, in Upper Silesia.

† Thirty-fourth Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society, p. 30. Thirty-fifth Report, p. 35. Thirty-eighth Report, pp. 35, 36.

‡ In his *mandement*, or annual address for Lent, 1838.

book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and the Maccabees." The falsehood of this assertion is only equalled by its ignorance. The editions of the Scriptures, thus audaciously denounced, comprise only "those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church" (Art. VI.): and the books asserted to be "shamefully mutilated" are the apocryphal books, which were never recognized as canonical by the Jews (to whom were committed the oracles of God), nor by the primitive Christian Churches, nor by the modern Greek Church, nor by any general council; until the Council of Trent, in utter disregard of truth calling itself œcumenical or general, in the sixteenth century, pronounced them to be "holy and canonical," with an anathema against any one who should not receive all these apocryphal books.*

"It is not" (the Bishop of Bruges continues) "that the Church wishes to forbid altogether the reading of the holy Scriptures, in the vulgar tongue, to the simple and faithful. Such is not—such never was—the intention of this good mother; but she holds heretical Bibles in abhorrence, and utterly detests them. And with regard to other translations, the Church only permits the reading of them, where 'the translations are approved by the holy see, or published with the notes of the holy fathers, or of some Catholic doctors.'"[†]

Our surprise at the hostility to the Bible in Belgium will cease, when it is known that Popery flourishes in that country as in a hot-bed. Rome itself can scarcely "vie with it in blind and active zeal for all that is connected with the interests of that awful system; and, as may be expected, Rome shows itself in all its unblushing effrontery. Money is lavished on the building and adorning of churches, and shrines, and virgins. The Virgin Mary is exalted and worshipped as divine, and receives more homage than Christ. More offerings are made to her than to him; more confidence is placed in her intercession than in that of the Saviour!"[‡] The following blasphemous address of the Lord's Prayer to the blessed Virgin is translated from a card sold in the shops at Brussels, illuminated with gold and various colours:—

"A MARIE.

"NOTRE MÈRE QUI ÊTES AUX CIEUX.

"Notre mère qui êtes aux cieux, O Marie, que votre nom soit béni à jamais, que votre amour vienne à tous les cœurs, que vos desirs s'ac-

* Canones Conc. Trid., Sess. iv. Decretum de Canonicis Scripturis.

† Thirty-fourth Report of the Bible Society, pp. xxx., xxxi.

‡ Appeal of the Belgian Evangelical Society for 1843. [Brussels], 1843, p. 2.

complaisent en la terre comme au ciel ; donnez nous aujourd'hui la grace et la miséricorde, donnez nous le pardon de nos fautes, comme nous l'esperons de votre bonté sans bornes ; et ne nous laissez plus succomber à la tentation, mais delivrez nous du mal. Ainsi soit-il."*

That is :—

"TO MARY.

"OUR MOTHER WHO ARE IN HEAVEN.

"Our mother who are in heaven, O Mary, blessed be your name for ever ; let your love come to all our hearts, let your desires be accomplished on earth as in heaven ; give us this day grace and mercy ; give us the pardon of all our faults, as we hope it from your unbounded goodness ; and let us no more yield to temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen."

In PORTUGAL, the Scriptures are unknown among the peasantry.† In SPAIN, the Bible is a prohibited book, unless it be accompanied with notes from fathers and Romish divines : and the learned Felix Torres Amat, Bishop of Astorga, could not obtain permission from the congregation of the Index at Rome for publishing his Spanish version of the Scriptures, with notes, but on the condition "that he should show his readers that *the reading of the Bible is not necessary to salvation.*" This condition he subsequently fulfilled "by duly instructing the readers of his second edition that they might go to heaven without reading the word of God."‡ So recently as the year 1838, the circulation of the Gospel of St. Luke, which Mr. Borrow had translated into the dialect of the Gitanos, or Spanish gypsies (a numerous and degraded race), was prohibited by an ordonnance of the Spanish Government : as also was the circulation of the

* Appeal of the Belgian Evangelical Society for 1843, p. 3. On Ascension-day (May 25th), 1843, a splendid crown, composed of ninety ounces of pure gold, and containing 593 precious stones and 377 fine pearls, the *workmanship of which alone cost 280*l.* sterling*, was presented to a "miraculous image of the Virgin," invoked as the Mother of Mercy. This image was presented with all that imposing pomp and splendour with which Rome knows so well how to fascinate the senses, in the presence of the King and Queen of the Belgians, their son, the Duke of Brabant, and a vast multitude of their subjects. "The circle of the diadem bore an inscription — '*Maria Matri Misericordia*,' in azure letters, because" [as the editor of the *Journal de Bruxelles*, of May 31st, 1843, affirmed] "Mary is Queen of heaven by the almighty power of God. The emblems are taken from different royal and imperial crowns, to show that Mary's crown includes and far surpasses them all. On the top of the four arches (after the royal crown) is an orb surmounted by the sign of redemption, because the Mother of the Saviour reigns by this sign of salvation !!!" This golden-crowned image of the Virgin held in her arm an image of Christ as a *child*, on whose head was a small silver crown. But no offering was made to the child.

† Borrow's "Bible in Spain" (Home and Colonial Library, vol. i. p. 6).

‡ Rule's "Memoir of a Mission to Gibraltar," p. 70. London, 1844.

same Gospel in the Spanish Basque dialect, which is spoken in the provinces of Guipuscoa and Biscay.

In ITALY, the Virgin Mary is the chief object of devout veneration. "Thousands of facts might be adduced to show that the Virgin Mary, in the popular apprehension, is a great dressed up doll; and our Lord Jesus Christ a great baby seated in her lap, and under the tutelage of his mother..... If a beggar in the street asks alms, it is for the love of the Virgin. If a man fractures his arm, or breaks his leg, or falls into a river without being drowned, you see his votive offering decorating the altar of the Virgin, acknowledging that he has been cured or saved by her powerful intercession with her child. Our Lord is a King under age; his mother, a queen-regent."* Where the unscriptural and antiscritptural worship of the Virgin Mary prevails to such an extent as it does in Italy, it is no wonder that the Bible in the vulgar tongue is a proscribed book to the people. At Nice, for instance, in the dominions of the King of Sardinia, in 1837, twenty-four persons were imprisoned by order of the Sardinian Government, for the heinous crime of having in their possession the Bible, and some other religious books.† Similar restrictions against the Bible are in force at Leghorn. The deputation from the Church of Scotland for enquiring into the religious condition of the Jews, "hearing that Leghorn was a *free port*, thought that it might be free to receive the Gospel:" accordingly, without reserve, they gave tracts to the porters who carried their luggage, and to some by-standers. Scarcely, however, had an hour elapsed before their box of books and tracts, and their bag of *Hebrew* books, were sealed up and carried off by an officer, by whom they were sent to the censor at Florence for his examination. As might be expected, they were condemned by him. Just before their departure from Leghorn, many of their tracts were restored to them: "but all the copies of Dr. Keith's work on prophecy were detained, because it contained interpretations opposed to those of the Church of Rome." The deputation "afterwards learned that a *sentence of perpetual banishment* from Tuscany had been pronounced against them; a sentence" (they remark) they "could easily bear, but one that proves Popery to be still the silencer of the witnesses and the deadly enemy of the truth."‡

* Dr. Jarvis's "No Union with Rome," p.*38. Hartford [Connecticut]. 1843. 8vo.

† Archives du Christianisme, Sept. 9, 1837, p. 136.

‡ "Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews from the Church of Scotland, in 1839," pp. 20, 21, 31.

At ROME, "the Bible is a strange and rare book. The only edition of it authorized to be sold there is. in fifteen large volumes, which are filled with Popish commentaries. Of course none but the rich can purchase a copy of the sacred Scriptures; indeed, very few of the common people there know what we mean by the Bible."* It cannot, then, excite surprise that "the Bible is a strange and rare book" at Rome; for where "the system of the Roman communion is *fully* acted upon, the worship of the Virgin has almost superseded that of the Trinity."† In fact, not one edition of the New Testament in the original Greek has ever issued from the Roman, or even Italian, press. Cardinal Bellarmine, indeed, is said to have been engaged by *saint* Pius V. to superintend the printing of an authentic and faithful edition of the New Testament in Greek; but when it was on the point of performance, the Pope changed his mind.‡ After the lapse of about two hundred and fifty years, during the pontificate of Pius VI., the abate Spoletti contemplated the publication of the Vatican manuscript, for which purpose he applied to the Pope. No public permission was ever given: and though the private judgment of Pius at first was not unfavourable to the undertaking, yet he was induced to prevent the execution of Spoletti's design by the representations of Father Mamachi, master of the sacred apostolical palace, under the pretence that the Codex Vaticanus differed from the Vulgate, and might, therefore, if made known to the public, be prejudicial to the interests of the Christian religion! Spoletti presented a second memorial to the Pope, in which he answered the objections of Mamachi, but the powers of the Inquisition prevailed against arguments which had no other support than sound reason. He was, therefore, obliged to abandon the design, since the private indulgence of the Pope would be no security against the vengeance of the Inquisition.‡ In 1836, public curiosity was once more excited by the an-

* Clarke's "Glimpses of the Old World," vol. i. p. 396. "In Rome the English are closely watched by the authorities; and were any among them discovered seeking to propagate the Bible, they would be subjected to much annoyance." (Ciocchi's "Narrative of Iniquities and Barbarities practised at Rome in the Nineteenth Century," p. 153). In pp. 67-79, he has related a painfully interesting anecdote of the treatment of some devout monks who *wished* to read the Bible.

† Dr. Jarvis's Preface, p. iv., to the American edition of Hartwell Horne's "Mariolatry." Hartford [Connecticut]. 1844. 8vo.

‡ Bartoli, Vita del card. Bellarmino, p. 388, cited in Mendham's "Literary Policy of the Church of Rome, p." 77, note.

§ Marsh's Translation of "Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament," vol. ii. part i. p. 181; Part ii. pp. 644, 645. Michaelis writes the abate's name Spoletti; Dr. Wiseman, however, calls it Spaletti.

nouncement, in various journals, that an edition of the Septuagint version was in contemplation by Dr. (now cardinal) Mai; and some statements were made of the progress of the work. That curiosity was yet further excited by the following intelligence, from the *Diario Romano*, under the date of March 1, 1842, which was circulated throughout Europe by the various literary journals:—

“The illustrious Cardinal Angelo Mai finished, after ten years’ labour, an edition of the New Testament, with the variation of all the MSS. contained in the principal libraries of Rome and of the rest of Italy, and with numerous notes full of philological researches. The text taken by the cardinal for the basis of his edition is that of the celebrated MS. numbered 1209, in the library of the Vatican. This MS. dates up to the sixth century. At the suggestion of his eminence, the Roman Government has resolved to publish, at its own expense, a fac-simile of that manuscript, which is in golden letters (?) and in the continuous style of writing; that is to say, the words are not separated by spaces. The celebrated engraver, Ruspi, has been ordered to engrave on copper this fac-simile, copies of which are to be transmitted to all Christian Sovereigns.” *

The expectations naturally raised by this announcement have been disappointed. From private information lately received from Italy, we learn that *no* Greek New Testament, edited by Mai, has been published: and probably for the same reason which quashed the abate Spoletti’s proposed edition of the Vatican manuscript, viz., that, as it differs from the Latin Vulgate, the publication of it might be “prejudicial to the interests of the Christian religion;” that is, to the interests and designs of Popery. We shall not, however, be surprised, if at some future period it should transpire, that a considerable part (if not the whole) of the New Testament has been actually printed, but that Mai has been obliged to suppress it.

In IRELAND, the opposition of the Romish bishops and priests to the circulation of the unadulterated Scriptures is matter of notoriety.

The Romish archbishops and bishops, in giving publicity to the Encyclical Letter of Leo XII. (an extract of which is given in p. 414, *supra*), accompanied it with some “pastoral instructions to all the faithful;” in which they declared, that as the books distributed by the Bible Society, under the name of Bibles, or Testaments, or Tracts,

“Treat of religion, and are not sanctioned by us, or by any compe-

* The “Complete Catholic Directory, Almanac and Registry, for 1843.” Dublin. (p. 147).

tent authority in the Catholic [Romish] Church, the use, the perusal, or retaining of them is *entirely and without any exception* PROHIBITED to you. And should any of them be in your possession, they are to be returned to the persons who may have bestowed them on you, or otherwise to be *destroyed*."

With such truly pastoral instructions before them, it cannot excite surprise that numerous instances are on record of Bibles being committed to the flames under priestly influence; one of which (at Shinrone, in King's County,) was made the subject of a petition to the House of Commons in 1834.* But, not to dwell on former instances of Bible burning, the following extract from a sermon delivered by friar Jennings before Dr. M'Hale, the titular Romish Archbishop of Tuam, and several priests, will show the rancorous hatred of the Popish clergy there against the circulation and reading of the Bible:—

"Any person who practises the reading of the Bible will inevitably fall into everlasting destruction. I would, therefore, my dear friends and followers, most earnestly beseech you, *by the love that you bear to the Virgin Mary* and to the saints—by the love that you bear to the dear priests, not to allow these Bible readers near your houses—not to speak to them when you meet them on the roads; but put up your hands and bless yourselves, and *pray* to God and to *the Virgin Mary* to keep you from being contaminated by the poison of the Bible. The worst of all pestilences—the infectious pestilence of the Bible—will entail on yourselves and children the everlasting ruin of your souls. They who send their children to schools where the Scriptures are read, give their children bound in chains to the devil."†

Will any Romanist, after this most explicit declaration, dare to assert that the Romish ecclesiastics encourage the reading of the Bible? When such sentiments as these are lauded by bishops and priests (for Mr. Jennings's philippic against the reading of the Scriptures is stated to have been greatly commended), can it excite surprise that the Bible should be destroyed wherever sacerdotal influence prevails? The following is the most recent instance of destroying a portion of the Scriptures which has come to our knowledge:—

"NATIONAL EDUCATION.—In a national school not a hundred miles from Killarney, a little girl, one of the scholars, was so rash as to exhibit a little gilt Testament, which some perverting person had bestowed upon her. The commotion excited was commensurate to the crime. The little offender was called forth, whipped before the eyes of

* Hansard's "Parliamentary Debates," vol. xxiv. cols. 440-446.

† *Dublin Evening Packet*, as printed in the *St. James's Chronicle* of August 17th, 1844.

her companions; and the 'gospel of the devil,' as the English New Testament has been entitled by the Holy See, *was torn in pieces before the eyes of the school, for general edification.*"*

But the destroying of the Scriptures is not confined to Belgium or to Ireland: it reaches wherever the influence of the Papal hierarchy extends. A recent traveller in the East, Dr. Hogg, after describing the religious toleration which had been established by the then Egyptian Government in Syria and Palestine, informs us that the Franciscan monks at Damascus, disregarding the tolerant example of their rulers, entertained a jealous apprehension of Protestant missionary agency. "This" (he states) "had been exemplified on the departure of the American missionaries, when these pious fathers required all the Christian communities to give up the Bibles and Tracts with which they had been supplied. The Catholics" (Romanists) "and Maronites obeyed; but the Greeks resisted their admonitions. One Sunday, after performing mass, *the books thus collected were PUBLICLY BURN'T before the assembled congregation in the court of the convent.*"†

Nor have the Scriptures been more favourably regarded in SOUTH AMERICA. At Rio Janeiro, for instance, in the empire of Brazil, the Bible—to an astonishing and almost incredible extent—is a new book: and a famine of the word of God has subsisted from generation to generation.‡ In the recently formed republic of Ecuador, a benevolent individual, who had opened a school for females, and circulated some Bibles and Tracts, was denounced by name to the minister of the interior by the Bishop of Quito, for the "crying enormity" of having "promoted the general reading of the Bible without notes, in the Spanish tongue, contrary to the *prohibitions* of the Holy Roman Catholic Church."§

We now come to ENGLAND. Passing over the facts, which are familiar to every reader of English history, respecting the efforts made to suppress the circulation and reading of the holy Scriptures between the reigns of Henry IV. and Henry

* The *Kerry Evening Post*, as printed in the *St. James's Chronicle* of August 1, 1844.

† Dr. Hogg's "Visit to Alexandria, Damascus, and Jerusalem," vol. ii. p. 42. London, 1835. 8vo.

‡ Letter of Rev. J. Spaulding, dated Rio Janeiro, Sept. 23, 1837. Elliott's "Delineation of Roman Catholicism," vol. i. p. 70. New York, 1842. 8vo. In p. 23 of the improved London edition. 1844.

§ Letter of the Bishop of Quito, Feb. 18, 1838. Ibid. p. 71. (p. 23, London edition).

VIII. and in the sanguinary reign of Mary, we will adduce two or three comparatively recent proofs, which will show that, notwithstanding the assertions so frequently made that the Romish clergy do not withhold the Scriptures from the people, every impediment is interposed to prevent them from having free access to the word of God in their mother tongue.

In a letter addressed to Bishop Marsh, in 1813, by the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, a Romish priest, at that time resident in London, he stated—"If any of the Bible Societies feel disposed to try our esteem for the Bible, by presenting us with some copies of a Catholic version, *with or WITHOUT notes*, we will gratefully accept and faithfully distribute them." This offer was instantly met. Funds were raised, and a committee was formed, by whom steps were taken for printing the Anglo-Romish version of the Scriptures, without notes, for distribution among poor Romanists, either gratuitously or at a small price. This benevolent undertaking, however, was frustrated by the Romish priests. Even Mr. Gandolphy, who had expressed his readiness to co-operate in the distribution of the Scriptures, opposed the execution of this design; alleging, by way of excuse, that "the priests could not go about to desire people to receive Bibles, because the Catholics" [Romanists] "*did NOT in anywise consider the Scriptures necessary.*" Mr. Gandolphy was positive that their clergy would not relax a principle which had always been in exercise to that time; that they would never put the English Scriptures into the hands of the poor and ignorant; nor yet give the Bible gratuitously, even with notes, to everybody who applied for it, but only under the direction and at the will of their superiors.*

Thus it appears very plainly, that the Romish priests dare not trust their common people with the word of God, even as translated into English by themselves, without safeguards of their own erection, to prevent the people from finding in it a meaning unfavourable to their fundamental principles.†

More recently, a pretended "Catholic Bible Society" was formed (perhaps we should rather say announced), in 1838, at Whitwick, near Ashby-de-la-Zouch, in Leicestershire. One of the motives assigned for instituting it was "the anxious desire" felt by its projectors "in each individual possessing a Bible;" but the plan and operations of that society were such as to make it not uncharitable to say, that the object of its supporters was not so much to promote a large distribution of the holy

* Correspondence on the formation, objects, and plan of the Roman Catholic Bible Society, pp. 12-14. London, 1813. 8vo.

† "The Protestant," vol i., p. 259.

Scriptures, as to screen their priests from the imputation of being hostile to such an undertaking. A single instance will show that there was no real design on the part of this pretended "Catholic Bible Society," to aid in the circulation and reading of the Scriptures. A poor man, who subsequently became a Romanist, having applied for one of this society's Bibles, was told that Bibles were just then scarce, but that he should have one after a time. This circumstance was no sooner noticed in a tract issued by the vigilant committee of the Loughborough and Ashby Protestant Tract Society, than the promoters of this Romish Bible Society felt themselves obliged to give notoriety to the fact of their society having been established nine months previously. Soon after its establishment, indeed, they had circulated hand-bills announcing it; but these had been so cautiously distributed, that the bulk of the population were left in utter ignorance of its existence. Nay, some respectable individuals, living within a few hundred yards of its officers, had never heard of it, until its inefficiency was noticed by the committee of the above-named society; and matters were so arranged that those officers (four obscure laymen) had little power of indiscreetly increasing the circulation of a book of which the Romish Church has ever been so jealous. They had themselves no copies of the Bible in their hands for sale, but were obliged to have recourse to their superiors at the neighbouring villages of Grace-Dieu or Tin Meadows.* Finally, so limited were the operations of this so-called Bible Society, established at Whitwick—so far as the circulation of the Bible is concerned—that it was deemed expedient to change its title, and it now professes to be a Bible and Tract Society.†

In London the emissaries of Rome have not dared *publicly* to deprive Romanists of the Scriptures; but *privately* they leave no effort unattempted, as the following instances, extracted from the thirteenth report (for 1841-42) of the Prayer Book and Homily Society, will sufficiently prove.

A widow having been taken seriously ill, was attended by the Sisters of Mercy, who

"continued their visits, and ultimately prevailed on her to receive the visits of the Roman Catholic priest. When the priest attended her, he told her that unless she and her daughter embraced the faith of the Roman Catholic Church she could not be saved. He told her also that she would never see her husband again, for he had died a

* Fourth Report for 1839, of the Loughborough and Ashby Protestant Tract Society, pp. 10-14.

† Fifth Report for 1840, p. 18.

heretic, and was damned, and had gone to hell. The poor woman, being weak in faith, and frightened, believed what the priest had said ; and from that time until a few days before her death she confessed to the priest.

"Father —— and the Sisters of Mercy continued to visit her regularly ; and she was at length so far led into the errors of the wicked, that she compelled her daughter to attend the Roman Catholic worship. On the first occasion of the young woman going into the Roman Catholic chapel, **THE PRIEST TOOK HER BIBLE FROM HER.** This much grieved her : it had been given her by her father before he last went to sea. The priest made her kneel down before the image of the Virgin Mary, and told her that the Virgin-Mother was interceding for her. The poor widow, before her death, urged her daughter to follow the Roman Catholic religion. The widow was at last taken off rather suddenly, and died in the Roman Catholic faith, but her death was not announced at the convent. The priest and the sisters of the convent afterwards told the daughter that her mother could not enter heaven because she had not had her mouth sealed." (pp. 58, 59.)

This young woman was subsequently visited by one of the teachers and visitors of a Sunday-school, and by the clergyman of the parish, by whom she was received back as a communicant of the Church of England.

"In the parish of ——, a poor woman was confined to her bed, in the last stage of consumption. The Sisters of Mercy (so called), from the convent at ——, heard of her circumstances, and on one Sunday morning two of them paid the poor woman a visit. They found her in the Protestant faith.....The first thing of a religious character they mentioned was—that **HER READING THE BIBLE WAS OF NO USE ;** that, **BEING A PROTESTANT, SHE WAS UNDER THE CURSE ;** THAT **HER PRAYERS WERE OF NO AVAIL ;** THAT **SHE WAS ALREADY DAMNED, AND WOULD GO TO HELL ;** and having thus declared their message, they left her." (p. 60.)

We spare our readers the pain of reading further particulars of this affecting case ; suffice it to state, that this poor woman was attended by a visitor and teacher of the parochial Sunday-school, who lent her the very useful homily against the fear of death, which afforded her much consolation, and also by the clergyman of the parish, who poured in the balm of the Gospel, and she departed in peace.

Such are some of the machinations of Rome against the circulation of the Bible ; and they demonstrate the fact, that the Romish Church is now, as much as ever she was, "an enemy to the reading and circulating of the holy Scriptures," whatever English or Irish Romanists may assert or insinuate to the contrary. But, not content with preventing the circulation of the Bible wherever they can, the Romish bishops and clergy fur-

ther defame the Protestant versions of the Scriptures as being corrupt. This false charge is as old as the Reformation. In 1582, Gregory Martin published an attack upon the English Bibles then in use, entitled, "A Discoverie of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretiques of our Daies, specially the English Sectaries." Martin's attacks were met and refuted by the learned Dr. Fulke, Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, who published, in 1583, "A Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holie Scriptures into the English Tong, against the Manifold Cauils, Frivolous Quarrels, and Impudent Slaunders of Gregorie Martin." This work was edited for the Parker Society in 1843, with great care and accuracy, by the Rev. Charles Henry Hartshorne, M.A., who has enriched it with numerous valuable notes and references. So entirely satisfactory was Dr. Fulke's vindication of our English Bibles deemed, that no further attack appears to have been made upon them by Romanists, until Thomas Ward, a Romish schoolmaster, in 1688, published his "Errata of the Protestant Bible," which (as he admitted in his preface*) is nothing more than an abridgment of Gregory Martin's volume: it is a performance replete with coarse invective and vulgar abuse. This work has been several times reprinted in Ireland in the course of the present century (the last edition was in 1841), under the auspices of the Romish bishops and clergy. The entire number of texts, set down by Ward as erroneous, amounts to one hundred and forty: of these he denounces one hundred and twenty as "damnable corruptions," and adverts to the remaining twenty only in a general way, considering them as not done "with an ill-design." The allegations of Ward were most completely refuted by the Rev. Drs. Ryan and Grier, who, in 1808 and 1812, severally published elaborate answers to Ward's "Errata." A still more satisfactory vindication of our authorized version of the Bible from the calumnies of Ward exists in the FACT that the Anglo-Romish edition of the Bible, published at Dublin, in 1825†, with

* Page 22 of the edition printed at London, in 1738.

† "The Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate, diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions, in divers languages; the Old Testament first published by the English College at Douay, A.D. 1609; and the New Testament, first published by the English College at Rheims, A.D. 1582, with annotations, references, and an historical and chronological Index. The whole revised and diligently compared with the Latin Vulgate. The stereotype edition. Dublin: Printed by Richard Coyne. London: Published by Keating and Brown, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square, and 68, Paternoster-row. MDCCLXXV." 8vo.

the approbation of Dr. Daniel Murray,* titular Romish Archbishop of Dublin, has been altered according to *our* correct version in at least three instances in which Ward had denounced the latter as heretical:—

1. "Rom. viii. 18. *Rhemish Testament.* (*True English, according to Ward*).—Not condign to the glory to come.
Protestant Bible.—Not worthy to be compared with the glory.

Archbishop Murray's Bible.—Not worthy to be compared with the glory.

"'They (*i. e.*, heretics) translate *not worthy* against merits.'—*Table of Heretical Corruptions, Rhem. Test. 2d Ed. Ant. 1600.*

"Note.—See '*Ward's Errata*,' *Dublin Ed. 1807, page 74.*—*Art. 'Protestant Translations against Merits and Meritorious Works.'*

2. "Heb. ii. 9. *Rhemish Testament.* (*True English, according to Ward*).—But him that was a little lessened under the angels, we see Jesus, because of the passion of death, crowned with glory and honour.

Protestant Bible.—But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.

Archbishop Murray's Bible.—But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour.

"'They (*i. e.*, heretics) transpose the words against the merit of Christ himself.'—*Table of Heretical Corruptions.*

"In fine, so obstinately are they set against merits, and meritorious works, that some of them think that even Christ himself did not merit his own glory and exaltation; for making out of which error, I suppose, they have transposed the words of this text; thereby making the apostle say, that Christ was made inferior to angels by his suffering death; that is, says Beza, *For to suffer death*; by which they quite exclude the true sense, that *For suffering death he was crowned with glory*, which are the true words and meaning of the apostle. But in their last translations they so place the words, that they will have it left so ambiguous, as you may follow which sense you will. Intolerable is their deceit!"—*Ward's Errata, page 75. Dublin Ed. 1807, (46).*

3. "1 Pet. i. 25. *Rhemish Testament.* (*True English, according to*

* In his Latin Approbation, dated Dublin, March 7th, 1825, and printed on the back of the title-page, Dr. Murray declares his approval of the edition published by Richard Coyne, which had been most diligently compared, by *his authority*, with the Clementine edition of the Latin Vulgate, and with the Douay Old Testament of the year 1609, the Rhemish New Testament of 1582, and other *approved* English versions; and he declares that the same may be read with profit by the faithful, the accustomed conditions being observed (meaning, we presume, those which are prescribed by the Council of Trent, and the rules of the Index above given).

Ward).—And this is the word that is evangelized among you.

Protestant Bible.—And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you.

Archbishop Murray's Bible.—And this is the word which by the Gospel hath been preached unto you."

"Here they (*i. e.*, heretics) add, *by the Gospel is preached*, in favour of their heresy, that there is no other word of God but the written word only."—*Heret. Corrupt. ut supra*.

"*By the Gospel* : these words are added deceitfully and of ill intent, to make the simple reader think that there is no other word of God but the written word ; for the common reader hearing this word, Gospel, conceives nothing else."—*Ward's Errata*, p. 87. Dublin Ed. 1807. (70).

"In all the above cases, the reading stigmatized by Ward and the compiler of the 'Table of Heretical Corruptions,' as false, heretical, abominable, &c., has been adopted by Archbishop Murray in his text, which, though containing in these cases all the supposed Errata of our Bible, is declared by him suited for the profitable perusal of the faithful."* (pp. 19-21).

Consequently, all the calumnies and ribaldry, which Ward and Gregory Martin (from whom he copied) have poured upon our authorized version, fall upon the Romish titular archbishop of Dublin. "This defence of our version against Ward is the most complete possible : for it shows that the very Church, whose clergy, as a body, patronized and have quoted from his work, are to the full as obnoxious to his censures as we are."†

But to return to the early English versions of the Bible thus denounced by Gregory Martin and Mr. Ward. It cannot excite surprise that they should have required revision and alteration, when it is considered what a ferment existed at the time when they were made, and how imperfect and unsettled the English language then was, which necessarily became the medium of interpretation. But how much more justly may it be retorted upon the doctors of the Romish Church, that the discordant copies of the Latin Vulgate, on the principle applied by Ward to the English Bibles, have for centuries

* Rev. George Hamilton's "Observations on the Present State of the Roman Catholic English Bible," addressed to the Roman Catholic archbishop of Dublin, and showing that it has never been edited on any uniform plan ; that the principles adopted by the Rhemish translators have been abandoned ; and that the censures of "Ward's Errata" are as applicable to it as to the Protestant Bible. Dublin : 1825, 8vo.

† "Hamilton's Observations," p. 21.

deceived not merely a single nation; but all Christendom. There are two celebrated editions of the Latin Vulgate version (in which the apocryphal books are intermingled with the canonical books), published by two infallible pontiffs, between which the most grave and conflicting variations and contradictions are to be found, viz., the Sixtine and the Clementine editions. The Sixtine Bible (as it is commonly termed), was published at Rome in 1590. In a bull prefixed to it, Sixtus V. declared that this edition should, without hesitation, be deemed and taken for that which the Council of Trent, in its fourth session, had pronounced to be authentic; and ordained that it should be adopted throughout the Romish Church. But, notwithstanding the labours bestowed on this edition by the Pope, it was discovered to be so exceedingly incorrect, that his successor, Gregory XIV., caused it to be suppressed: and Clement VIII., who succeeded Gregory in the pontificate, published another authentic edition of the Vulgate, called from him the Clementine edition. In the preface to this edition, it is asserted to be the ancient and vulgate edition of the Bible. This edition differed more than any other from that of Sixtus V. These fatal variances between editions alike promulgated by pontiffs, arrogating to themselves infallibility, did not escape detection: and our learned countryman, Thomas James, in 1600, published his "*Bellum Papale sive Concordia Discors Sixti Quinti et Clementis Octavi, circa Hieronymianam Editionem.*"* In this work not fewer than *two thousand* additions, omissions, contradictions, and other differences between the Sixtine and Clementine editions, are pointed out. Some of these differences, truth requires it to be stated, are but trivial variations: but others are directly contradictory, and all are sufficient to show that, notwithstanding the assumed infallibility of their pontifical editors, both editions partake of the nature of all human productions.† In a subsequent publication, Doctor

* A new and accurate edition of this very rare and curious work was published by the Rev. J. E. Cox, in 1840, in 1 vol. 12mo.

† We select a few instances of DIRECT CONTRADICTIONS between these two editions, from "*James's Bellum Papale.*"

	<i>Sixtine Edition.</i>	<i>Clementine Edition.</i>
Exod. xvi. 3.	<i>Induxistis.</i>	<i>Eduxistis.</i>
" xxiii. 18.	<i>Victimæ tuæ.</i>	<i>Victimæ meæ.</i>
Levit. xxvii. 17.	<i>Juxta æstimationem suam.</i>	<i>Juxta æstimationem tuam.</i>
Deut. xxiv. 6.	<i>Apposuit</i>	<i>Opposuit.</i>
Josh. ii. 18.	<i>Signum non fuerit.</i>	<i>Signum fuerit</i>
" xi. 19.	<i>Quæ se non traderet.</i>	<i>Quæ se traderet.</i>
1 Reg. iv. 9.	<i>Nobis.</i>	<i>Vobis.</i>

James detected nearly a hundred more similar conflicting passages.*

Dr. Whitaker, the learned antagonist of Cardinal Bellarmine, has convicted the Latin Vulgate translation of being corrupted in nearly forty instances.†

	<i>Sistine Edition.</i>	<i>Clementine Edition.</i>
2 Reg. ix. 12.	Mensam tuam.	Mensam meam.
3 Reg. vii. 9.	Extrinsecus.	Intrinsecus.
2 Esdr. iii. 28.	Ad portam.	a porta.
John vi. 65.	Qui essent credentes.	Qui essent non credentes.
2 Peter i. 16.	Indoctas.	Doctas.

Yet both these conflicting editions are to be received as authentic!

* James's Treatise of the "Corruptions of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers," by the Pastors and Prelates of the Church of Rome, for Maintenance of Popery, pp. 276-310. London: 1688. 8vo.

† *Controversia I. de Sacra Scriptura. Quæstio II. Operum Tom. i. pp. 289-299.* (Genevæ, 1610; folio). The first corruption of the Latin Vulgate specified by Dr. Whitaker is that of Gen. iii. 15, where we read "*ipsa conturbabit tuum caput*," *she shall bruise thy head*. This false rendering is followed in all modern Romish versions of the Old Testament, contrary to the original Hebrew, which has נָחָשׁ *he*, not אִשָּׁה *she*. Αὐτός—*he*, is the rendering of the Septuagint version, notwithstanding the Greek σπέρμα (*seed*), is neuter. The Targum, or Chaldee Paraphrase of Onkelos also renders it *he*; which rendering is found in the edition of the ancient ante-Hieronymian Latin version, published at Rome in 1588, under the authority of Sixtus V. The Hebræo-Samaritan text and the Old Syriac version read *it*, meaning the seed of the woman. Jerome himself reads *ille, he*, in his commentary on Isaiah; (lib. xvi. cap. lvii. Op. tom. iii. col. 434.) and *ipsa, he*, in his "*Questions on Genesis*;" (Op. tom. ii. col. 510.) and so he translated it, as appears from the edition of his version which forms the first volume of the Benedictine edition of his works. In the note on Genesis iii. 16, in the *Anglo-Romish et Douay version* of the Old Testament, we read—"ipsa, the woman; so divers of the fathers read this place." Cardinal Bellarmine affirmed that many of the ancients read the same (sic multos veteres legisse). But though all the ancient ecclesiastical writers, commonly called "the fathers," should declare that we ought to read *ipsa, she*; yet that is nothing to us. Their affirmations cannot preponderate against the positive evidence to the contrary which is derived from the Hebrew original, corroborated as it is by the Hebræo-Samaritan text, and by the ancient Greek, Chaldee, Syriac, and ante-Hieronymian versions. The false rendering of *ipsa, she*, for *ipse, he*, is of considerable antiquity. The very ancient manuscript of the Latin Vulgate version in the British Museum, which is acknowledged to be one of the copies of Alcuin's recension of that version, and which was written a thousand years since (about the middle of the eighth century), has this false rendering, which was most probably introduced in order to support the growing superstition of the age in favour of the blessed Virgin Mary, to whom prayers are directly offered in the Breviary and other authorized devotions of the Romish Church, and also by the present Pope in the conclusion of his encyclical letters, dated Aug. 15, 1832, and May 8, 1844. But how could she bruise the serpent's head, when "she brought forth her first-born Son," Jesus Christ? But to bring forth Christ is not to bruise the serpent's head; for it is one thing to bruise the serpent's head, and another thing to bring forth Him by whom that head is to be bruised. Could she bruise the serpent's head when she believed in Christ? But to believe in Christ as the *only* Saviour and Redeemer of the world is the characteristic and the privilege of *all* who truly bear the Christian name. "The blessed Virgin did not, and could not, undertake that mysterious atonement which comprises the whole work of Christ from before the creation of the world (when he said, in the counsels of eternity, 'Lo! I come to do thy

But the most signal instance of wilful falsifications of the word of God is to be found in the French translation, published at Bordeaux in 1686, the extreme rarity of which induces us to offer to our readers some particulars, which we trust will be as interesting to them, as they are important in showing the arts to which Popery has recourse, for the propagation of its unscriptural and antiscritptural tenets and practices.

In the year 1685, after unheard-of cruelties had been inflicted upon the defenceless French Protestants,* Louis XIV. revoked the edict of Nantes; deprived them of their civil and religious privileges; and compelled hundreds of thousands to abandon their native land, and seek in foreign countries an asylum, in which they might worship God without molestation and without restraint. In no long time, however, it was found necessary to humour the new converts to Popery ("new Catholics" they were termed), by giving them something which might be called Scripture. As the then existing versions of Veron and of Marolles would not do, because they had lost their reputation; nor that of Mons, because it was odious to the Jesuits; nor that of Amelotte, because it contained some things of which heretics might take advantage: a new translation, therefore, was published at Bordeaux in 1686, purporting to be executed by the theologians of Louvain, but replete with the most audacious falsifications of the sacred text.† The following is the title of this translation:—

"Le Novveav Testament de Nôtre Seigneur Iesvs Christ. Traduit de Latin en François par les Theologiens de Louvain. A Bordeaux,

will, O God,') to the day when he shall give up the kingdom of the Mediator to God, and shall be one with his Father.....The blessed Virgin did not fulfil the prophecies, which declared that the Messiah, and not his selected mother, should teach, suffer, and die. The blessed Virgin did not pray more earnestly at Gethsemane, nor die on the cross for our sins, nor rise again for our justification. The blessed Virgin did not ascend into heaven, nor pour forth the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The blessed Virgin is not the Lamb that was slain; nor shall the blessed Virgin be the judge to condemn, nor the Saviour to deliver, nor the quickening Spirit to change the living and to raise the dead. The blessed Virgin has not the keys of death and hell; and if it were possible that the happiness of the spirits of the blessed in heaven could be diminished by the proceedings of man upon earth.....the soul of the blessed Virgin would be grieved at the homage which is paid to herself, instead of being directed to Him, of whom the blessed Virgin said, 'My spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour,'"
—*Townsend's Commentary on the Bible*, vol. i., p. 66, on Gen. iii. 15.

* See a detail of these barbarities (which Bossuet, with most profligate mockery of language, termed "the holy severity of the Romish Church, which will not tolerate error") in the *Church of England Quarterly Review*, vol. xv., pp. 100-103.

† *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, [Par Elie Benoist.] Tom. iii., part 3, p. 944.

chez Jacques Montgiron-Millanges, Imprimeur du Roy et du College.
M.DC.LXXXVI. Avec approbation et permission.*

This translation was sanctioned by the approbation of two divines,† who attested that, by an ordonnance of his most Christian Majesty, it had been reviewed by several doctors in theology of the University of Louvain, and that it was very "useful to all those who, with the permission of superiors, should be capable of reading it." In 1690, Dr. Kidder, Bishop of Bath and Wells, published his "Reflections on a French Testament, printed at Bordeaux, An. Dom. 1686," in which he has noticed one hundred and thirty-six texts, that are either altered, added, or omitted, or are inconsistencies and typographical errors. This tract, having long been extremely rare, Dr. Cotton, Archdeacon of Cashel, reprinted it at London in 1827, with an introductory "Memoir." To this "memoir" our readers are necessarily referred for further bibliographical details respecting the Bordeaux New Testament, which has long been one of the scarcest of modern books, in consequence of the greater part of the impression being (most probably) destroyed. We rejoice, however, to know that the persevering researches of bibliographers have ascertained that not fewer than nine copies are preserved in England and in Ireland, viz., two at Oxford, one in the Bodleian library (the identical copy which had formerly belonged to Bishop Kidder), and another in the library of Christ Church College; a copy in the archiepiscopal library at Lambeth; a copy in the library of the Dean and Chapter of Durham; a copy in the library of the Duke of Devonshire; a copy in the library of the Right Hon. Thomas Grenville; and a copy in the library of the British Museum, into which it passed on the sale of the library of his late Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex. There are also two copies at Dublin—one in the library of Trinity College, and one in the library founded by Archbishop Narcissus Marsh.‡ Having

* This title is transcribed from the copy of the Bordeaux New Testament, which formerly belonged to Cæsar de Missy, Minister of one of the French Churches in London, and which afterwards was purchased by his late Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex. To this edition our references are made in the following pages. The title-pages of the copies at Oxford, described by Dr. Cotton, vary from that above given. In the Bodleian copy, after Bordeaux, we read—"chez Simon Boe, Marchand Libraire, rue St. James [Jacques?] près de Marche:" and in the copy belonging to the library of Christ Church College, "chez la veuve de G. de la Court, et N. de la Court, imprimeur du Roy et de Monseigneur l'Archevêque, rue de S. James [Jacques?]" M.DC.LXXXVI. Avec approbation et permission."—*Cotton's Memoir*, p. 3.

† "Lopes, *Chanoine Theological de l'Eglise Metropolitaine*" and "*Germaine Carme*."

‡ *Cotton's Memoir*, pp. 9, 10. *Pettigrew's Bibliotheca Sussexiana*, vol. ii. p. 543. *Bibliotheca Grenvilliana*, vol. ii., p. 724.

premised these brief historical particulars, we shall proceed to submit to the attentive consideration of our readers a few specimens, from actual collation, of the *most* audacious falsifications of the writings of the apostles and evangelists which are to be found in the Bordeaux New Testament, and which we shall exhibit in juxta-position with our own authorized English version.

<i>Authorized English Version.</i>	<i>Bordeaux New Testament.</i>
1. MATT. iii. 2. and iv. 7.—Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.	Faites pénitence: car le Royaume des Cieux est prochain. (pp. 7 and 16).
LUKE x. 13.—They had repented a great while ago.	Elles eussent fait pénitence dès long temps. (p. 194).
LUKE xii. 3-5.—Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.	Mais si vous ne faites pénitence, vous périrez tous semblablement. (p. 206).
LUKE xvi. 30.—But if one went to them from the dead they will repent.	Mais si quelqu'un des morts va vers eux, ils feront pénitence. (p. 217).
ACTS ii. 38.—Repent, and be baptized every one of you.	Faites pénitence, et que chacun de vous soit baptisé.
ACTS iii. 19.—Repent ye, therefore, and be converted.	Faites donc pénitence et vous convertissez. (p. 353).

In all these instances the Greek word *μετανοεῖν* (which in our version is correctly rendered *repent*) is falsely rendered *do penance*, in order to support the Romish tenet of penance, which the Council of Trent, under an anathema, decreed should be believed to be a sacrament instituted by Jesus Christ.* To *do penance*, in the Romish sense of the word, imports the performance of some outward actions, or the exercising of certain severities upon oneself, as a token of the sorrow felt for past misbehaviour or transgression; a notion which has no foundation whatever in Scripture. Whereas, in the language of the New Testament, to *repent* implies not only sorrow for what is done amiss (in whatever mode that sorrow may be expressed), but chiefly what is consequent upon it; namely, a thorough change of the inward disposition of the mind.† In the passages above cited Bishop Kidder truly remarks, the

* Canones Concilii Tridentini. Sess. vii. Decret. de Sacramentis in genere. can. 1.

† Tertullian's definition of repentance is not unworthy of the reader's notice: "Nam et in Græco sono, *penitentia* nomen non ex delicti confessione, sed ex animi demutatione compositum est." Adversus Marcionem, lib. ii. cap. xxv. (Opera, p. 394. Paris, 1675, fol.) On this passage his Romish editor, Pamelius, sensibly remarks:—"Vox *μετάνοια*, pro qua ex Græco *penitentia* transfertur, à *μετανοεῖν* derivatur; quod non delicti sed animi demutationem significat, sicut patet ex Xenophonte, initio lib. i. *παίδειας* et aliis Græcis scriptoribus." (*Ibid.* p. 394, note c.)

Bordeaux translators "give the reader an occasion of a very imperfect idea of true repentance, it being possible that men may do penance (according to the import of the phrase in the Roman Church), and not repent."*

2. The Council of Trent, in its twenty-second session, decreed :—" If any one say that in the mass there is not a true and proper sacrifice offered unto God ; or, that to be offered is nothing else but for Christ to be given to us for to eat, let him be accursed."† In order to maintain this unscriptural and antiscryptural tenet, the authors of the Bordeaux New Testament have actually foisted the mass into their version of the thirteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles :—

Authorized English Version.

Bordeaux New Testament.

Acts xiii. 2.—As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted.

Or comme ils offroyent au seigneur le sacrifice de la messe, et qu'ils jeunoient. (p. 364).

That is, "as they offered to the Lord *the sacrifice of the mass*, and fasted." The words printed in italics are falsely inserted in the text, in order to support the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass. Our English version follows the Greek original, which in this passage is accurately rendered in the Latin Vulgate, as well as in the Anglo-Romish version, commonly termed the Rheimish Testament. Still further to uphold the tenet of the sacrifice of the mass, the French translators have not hesitated to introduce the mass into the summaries of chapters to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark. In the contents of Matt. xxvi. we read, "*institue la messe*" [Jesus] "*institutes the mass* ;" so, in the contents of Mark xiv. we read, "*institution de la messe*"—"the institution of the mass."

"The translators of Bordeaux" (says a learned French refugee, who subsequently was an ordained minister in the Church of England‡) in order to support their version of the verb which is properly rendered "to minister," by "to offer sacrifice ;" and further to strengthen their doctrine on this point, affect most ridiculously to render the noun "a minister" by "a sacrificer." Thus, Heb. i. 7, "He maketh his ministers a flame of fire : " they render, "He maketh the flame of fire *his*

* Bishop Kidder's "Reflections," p. 33 of Dr. Cotton's reprint.

† Canones Conc. Trid. sess. xxii. De sacrificio missæ, can. 1. The Thirty-first Article of the Confession of Faith of the Church of England, based upon Scripture, rightly terms "the sacrifices of masses" "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

‡ The Rev. James Serces, Vicar of Appleby, in Lincolnshire, in his "Popery an Enemy to Scripture." pp. 77, 78. London: 1736. 8vo.

sacrificers.” * This is truly a new order of priests, never thought of before. What St. Paul says, “That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles,” they express thus: “That I should be *Leytourge*, that is to say, *sacrificer of Jesus Christ* among the Gentiles.” † In Heb. viii. 2, it is said that a high priest is “a minister of the sanctuary;” they make him “a *Litourge sacrificer* of the sanctuary.” ‡ ‘And a little lower (v. 6), where we read in our version, “Now hath He” [Christ] “obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also He is the mediator of a better covenant;” they were pleased to foist in an epithet: “Now” (they say) “our *Prince of the SACRIFICERS* has obtained a much more excellent SACRIFICING LITURGY,” or ministry; “for he is the mediator of a more excellent Testament.” § Which version agrees neither with the Vulgate nor with the old translation of Louvain.

The falsifications above exposed are not peculiar to the Bordeaux New Testament: they are also found in a French version of the New Testament, published by Francis Veron, in 1646, concerning which Simon informs us that, as Veron “was a professor of controversies, he adapted some passages to his own notions; as when he endeavours to find the word *mass* in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts, verse 2, where he translates “as the apostles *celebrated mass to the Lord.*” The reason which he gives us for his translation in this place is, that the Calvinists had often demanded of him in what part of Scripture it was expressed that the apostles said *mass.*” || A most substantial reason truly! In a Paris edition of the New Testament, printed in 1698, and purporting to be of the translation by the theologians of Louvain, the falsification of Acts

* “Qui fait de la flamme de feu ses SACRIFICATEURS.”

† “D’être *Leytourge*, c’est à dire, *sacrificateur* de Jesus Christ entre les Gentils.”

‡ “*Litourge sacrificateur* du sanctuaire.”

§ “Maintenant notre *Prince des SACRIFICATEURS* a obtenu une tant plus excellente *liturgie* SACRIFICATEUR; car il est mediateur d’un plus excellent Testament.”

|| “Simon’s Critical History of the Versions of the New Testament,” part ii., p. 236, London, 1692, 4to. The following is Veron’s rendering of Acts xiii. 2. “*Les apôtres celebrent la messe au seigneur*”—“the apostles celebrated *mass* to the Lord.” And the following is his remark above alluded to, in which he gives a reason (such as it is) for some of his most important alterations (falsifications we should rather say) of the sacred text:—“Le 1. et principal changement, du quel tous, tant Catholiques que separez, les uns bien aises de cette traduction, les autres s’en scandalisans, demanderent, a juste cause, raison, est, que j’ay traduit aux Actes 13, v. 2. *Comme les apostres celebrent la messe au seigneur.* Car nos separez nous demandent toujours, en quel lieu de l’Ecriture est il porté, *Que les apostres aient dit la messe?* Voicy la raison convainquante de ma traduction. Advis au Lecteur, immediately preceding the Nouv. Test. at the end, or what would be, if marked, p. 872.

xiii. 2, is adopted from the Bordeaux version; and in the first article of the *contents* of that chapter we have "*le sacrifice de la messe*"—"the sacrifice of the mass;" and in the margin of v. 2, lest it should escape the reader's notice, we have "*la sainte messe*"—"the holy mass." In the summary of contents of Luke xxii. we have "*le corps de Jesus Christ au sacrement, et le sacrifice de la messe*"—"the body of Jesus Christ in the sacrament, and the sacrifice of the mass." Additionally, in the margin of Luke xxii. 19, we read—"La messe instituée par Jesus Christ. Il commande aux apôtres de l'offrir"—"the mass instituted by Jesus Christ—he commands the apostles to offer it." The false translation of Acts xiii. 2, also appears in the Paris edition (1702, 8vo.) of the Louvain doctors' translation of the New Testament.

3. In the following passages the text is falsified, in order to support the Romish doctrine affirmed by Cardinal Bellarmine* (who refers to the decree of the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent)—viz., "That it is a work of piety to go on pilgrimages to holy places," that is, to visit the shrines or relics of particular reputed saints—sinful mortals, canonized or pronounced to be saints by various Popes:—

Authorized English Version.

Bordeaux New Testament.

LUKE ii. 41.—Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year.

Et ses père et mère alloient tous les ans en pèlerinage en Jerusalem. (p. 161).†

3 JOHN 5.—Beloved, thou doest faithfully whatsoever thou doest to the brethren, and to strangers.

Bien aimé, tu agis en vray fidelle en tout ce que tu fais envers les freres, et envers les pèlerins.‡ (Les Epistres de S. Paul, &c. p. 297).

2 COR. viii. 19.—And not *that* only, but who was also chosen by the Church to travel with us.

Et non seulement cela, mais aussi il a esté ordonné par les églises compagnon de nôtre pèlerinage. (Ibid. p. 104).

That is, "and not only that, but he was also appointed by the churches *the companion of our pilgrimage*." St. Paul is here speaking of a Christian brother who was selected to accompany him on his travels; yet the Louvain doctors affect to show that the practice of pilgrimages to reputed holy places is warranted by the New Testament. The Greek words ξενος and ξενος, in our version correctly rendered "stranger" and "stran-

* De Cultu Sacro., lib. iii. c. 8.

† That is, "And his father and mother went every year in pilgrimage to Jerusalem."

‡ That is, "Beloved, thou doest, like a true believer, whatsoever thou doest towards the brethren and towards pilgrims."

gers," are rendered *pèlerin* and *pèlerins*, "pilgrim" and "pilgrims," in Matthew xxv. 35, 38, 43, 44; xxvii. 7; and Luke xxiv. 8.

4. In the following passage the French translators have made an *addition* to the text, in order to support their unfounded distinctions between "*doulia*" and "*latría*:"—

Authorized English Version.

Bordeaux French Version.

LUKE iv. 8.—Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

Tu adoreras le seigneur ton Dieu, et serviras de *latría* à luy seul. (p. 166).

That is, "Thou shalt adore (or worship) the Lord thy God, and thou shalt serve him only *with latría*." This addition seems not to have occurred to the French translators, when they correctly rendered the strictly parallel passage in Matt. iv. 10.

5. In the French version of the Bible, also professing to be executed by the theologians of Louvain, and published at Paris in 1683, two years *before* the revocation of the edict of Nantes,* purgatory is inserted in the text of 1 Cor. iii. 15, in italic, as if it were an explanatory gloss: "*ainsi toutesfois par le feu de purgatoire*" (p. 685), yet so as by the fire *of purgatory*; but in the Bordeaux New Testament, published in the year *after* that event, purgatory is boldly introduced as an integral part of the sacred text:—

Authorized English Version.

Bordeaux New Testament.

1 COR. iii. 15.—If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.

Si l'œuvre de quelq' un brûle, il en portera la perte, mais il sera sauvé quant à luy, ainsi toutesfois comme par le *feu de purgatoire* (Les Epistres de St. Paul, &c., p. 53).

6. In like manner, in the Bible of 1683, the translators introduced the words *sacrament de* (sacrament of) in italics, as a gloss on 1 Cor. vii. 10, 2 Cor. vi. 14, and 1 Tim. iv. 3; but in the Bordeaux New Testament, marriage is unblushingly asserted to be a sacrament!

Authorized English Version.

Bordeaux New Testament.

1 COR. vii. 10.—And unto the married I command.

Mais à ceux qui sont conjoints par LE *SACREMENT DE mariage*, je leur commande (Les Epistres de St. Paul, p. 60).†

* La Sainte Bible, contenant le Vieil et le Nouveau Testament, traduit en François par les Theologiens de l' Université de Louvain. Paris, 1683, folio.

† But to those who are joined together by THE SACRAMENT OF marriage, I command,

2 COR. vi. 14.—Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers. Ne vous joignez point par LE SACRAMENT DE MARIAGE avec les Infidelles (Ibid, p. 100).*

1 TIM. iv. 3.—Forbidding to marry. Condamnans le SACRAMENT DE mariage (Ibid, p. 193).†

7. "The Roman Church" (says Bishop Kidder) "boasts herself as the *only* Catholic Church and pillar of truth. The holy Scriptures (as well as all ancient creeds) are silent in this matter. But these translators have by manifest FORGERY wrested them 'to testify' in her favour. 'In the latter times' (says St. Paul) 'some shall depart from the faith.' (1 Tim. iv. 1). *De la foy ROMAINE*, from the ROMAN faith, say the authors of this translation; and yet the Vulgar [Vulgate], the Rheims translation, and that of Mons, agree with the English; and as this is the sense of the Greek and [of] the versions, so is it manifest that the addition of *Roman* is nothing less than forgery and falsification of the text; a crime so great that I want words to express it by."‡

8. The translation of relics is insinuated with great adroitness in the French version of Heb. xi. 22, where the patriarch Joseph is boldly said to have "*ordered THE TRANSLATION of his bones*"—ordonna LA TRANSLATION de ses os. (Epistres de St. Paul, &c., p. 241). Whereas the Greek original, which is accurately rendered in our version, simply states that he "gave commandment concerning his bones."

9. In the following passage the Louvain doctors have made a bold *addition* to the sacred text, in order that they may establish the antiquity and efficacy of processions:—

Authorized English Version.

Bordeaux New Testament.

HEB. xi. 30.—By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they were compassed about seven days. Par la foy les murs de Jericho tomberent, après une procession de sept jours tout autour.

"By faith the walls of Jericho fell, after a *procession* of seven days all around" [them].

10. Lastly, an addition has also been made to the text of 1 John v. 17, in order to support the groundless and anti-scriptural distinction between mortal and venial sins. "There is a sin unto death," says St. John. No! say these French translators—"il y a quelque peche qui n'est point mortel, mais veniel." "There is a sin which is not mortal, but *venial*!"

* Do not join yourselves by THE SACRAMENT OF marriage with unbelievers.

† Condemning THE SACRAMENT of marriage.

‡ Bishop Kidder's "Remarks," p. 30. 8vo. edition.

The extent to which this article has unavoidably reached forbids us to give any further examples of the corruptions of the sacred text in the Bordeaux New Testament. We cannot, however, quit this topic, without adverting to certain falsifications that have been introduced into the Anglo-Romish version of the New Testament, which was first published at Rheims in 1582; and of which, as well as of the annotations appended to it, two confutations were published—viz., one by Dr. Fulke, Master of Pembroke College, in 1586, and since reprinted several times; the other by Thomas Cartwright, in 1618. Our references to the Rheimish Testament are made to the edition published, with the approbation of Dr. Murray, at Dublin, in 1825.

The verb *μετανοεω*, *to repent*, occurs thirty-four times in the Greek Testament. In Mark i. 15, Luke xvii. 4, and Rev. ii. 21, it is correctly translated *repent*, as in our authorized English version; and in Acts ii. 19, it is translated by the nearly equivalent words—*be penitent*. But in all the other passages it is falsely rendered *do penance*. In like manner, *μετάνοια*, *repentance*, is found twenty times in the New Testament. In two instances—viz., Matt. vi. 13, and Mark ii. 17—it is omitted in the Latin Vulgate, and consequently in the Rheimish translation of 1825. In four instances—viz., Acts v. 31 and xi. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 25, and Heb. xii. 17—it is correctly translated *repentance*, as in our authorized version. But in the remaining nineteen passages it is falsely translated *penance*; as we have seen, in page 438, that *μετανοεω* and *μετάνοια* are rendered in the Bordeaux New Testament, and for the same reason, viz., to support the Romish tenet of penance, which has no foundation whatever in Scripture.

πρεσβύτερος, *an elder*, occurs sixty-six times, and the compound noun *συνπρεσβύτερος*, *a fellow-elder*, once. In six instances—viz., in Acts xiv. 22 and xv. 2, 1 Tim. v. 17 and 19, Tit. i. 5, and James v. 14—*πρεσβύτερος* is rendered *priest*, in order to answer the purposes of the Church of Rome; although *πρεσβύτερος* differs greatly from *ιερευσ*, which means a *sacrificing priest*, like those who were employed under the Mosaic dispensation, or those who offered sacrifices to heathen deities. But there is no foundation whatever for the idea of a sacrificing priest in the New Testament, the Lord Jesus Christ alone being the High Priest of our profession; “who ONCE in the end of the world, hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;” and who, “by ONE offering, hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” (Heb. ix. 26; x. 14). In like manner, *πρεσβυτέριον*, *presbytery* (which occurs three

times in the New Testament), is, in 1 Tim. iv. 14, rendered *priesthood*. Dr. Fulke has refuted at some length the cavils of Gregory Martin against our Protestant correct translation of these three words, in his "Defence of the English Translations of the Bible" (chap. vi., pp. 240-277—Parker Society's edition); as those of Ward have been exposed and refuted by Dr. Grier, in his "Answer to Ward's Errata," (pp. 16-19).

Μυστήριον, *mystery*, occurs twenty-seven times, and it is correctly rendered in the Rheimish Testament (as in our authorized version), in every instance but one, viz., Eph. v. 32, where the Latin Vulgate rendering of *sacramentum* is translated *sacrament* (as we have seen, in pp. 442, 443, is the case with the Bordeaux New Testament), in order to support the Romish tenet, that marriage is a sacrament. Dr. Fulke's confutation of Gregory Martin's cavil at the Protestant rendering of *Μυστήριον* is worth reading ("Defence," pp. 493-496); as also his note on Eph. v. 32, in his "Confutation" of the Rheimish Testament.

The idiomatic phrases (common in Hellenistic and in classical Greek) of *τι ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ* and *τι ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ* occur; the former in Mark v. 7, Luke viii. 28, and John ii. 4; and the latter in Matt. viii. 29, Mark i. 24, and Luke iv. 34. And they are accurately rendered (after the Latin Vulgate *Quid mihi et tibi*, and *Quid nobis et tibi*), as in the English version, *What have I to do with thee?* and *What have we to do with thee?* in five out of the six passages. But John ii. 14, is falsely rendered, *What is that to me and to thee?* because the correct rendering would affect the unscriptural honour given to the Virgin Mary by the Romish Church.

The preceding instances are but a specimen of the falsifications of, and additions made to, the sacred text by the "Theologians of Louvain," and in the Anglo-Romish version of the New Testament. In the selection of these examples, care has been taken not to specify any passages which have the slightest semblance of authority from Manuscripts or Ancient Versions. Examples enough (we trust) have been adduced, to convince any candid reader, that the Scriptures have been deliberately and wilfully falsified, in order to support the novel dogmas of the modern Church of Rome, which are utterly destitute of Scripture evidence.

In conclusion, we most earnestly entreat all who may read these pages to be upon their guard against the seductive statements which at the present day are put forth and circulated in every part of the land, by emissaries and priests of the Roman obedience, in the hope of obtaining pro-

selytes to Popery, and of persuading Protestants to desert the pure faith of Christ (for which martyrs bled and were burnt at the stake), and adopt the corrupt and idolatrous religion of Rome. From the progress which Popery is stated, in some foreign journals, to have made in England since the year 1829, its advocates, especially on the continent, are sanguine in their anticipations of its ultimate triumph: and they regard the alleged increase of Tractarians and Tractarianism as one of the most favourable signs of the times. We do not sympathize in their dreamy anticipations. To the increase (*asserted* increase, we mean) of Romish chapels, some of them erected with great architectural beauty, not to say splendour, we can oppose the *actual* increase of churches (with assiduous pastors, who *devote* themselves to the spiritual welfare of their flocks), in which divine worship is solemnized in beautiful simplicity, and with our truly scriptural liturgy, in a language understood by the worshippers: and in which "the *pure* word of God is preached," and not traditions of man's invention; "and the sacraments are duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." (ART XIX.) We are not ignorant how adroitly the Romish Church adapts her seductions to the different temperaments of men. For the admirer of forms and of an imposing and splendid worship she has a gorgeous ritual and magnificent pageantry, which dazzle the eyes, while fragrant incense perfumes the air. The admirers of the fine arts are fascinated by the most exquisite productions of painting and of sculpture; while the lovers of music are ensnared by the performance of compositions, the most delightful as well as the most sublime, which can charm or gratify the ear. At the same time, for the ascetic, the mystical, and the enthusiast, she has her cloisters and all the forms of monastic life: while, for the devout and sentimental, prayers and meditations are provided, which are clothed in the most impassioned, not to say amatory language. To the restless pilgrim, whose piety needs a greater variety than the dull monotony of the cell, or the hermitage of the anchorite, or the death-like silence of the Trappist can afford, Rome presents shrines, relics, and reputed holy places, whither he may wander. "To the generous and benevolent she offers some fraternity or sisterhood of charity. To him who is inclined to take heaven by violence, she gives as much penance as he can desire: and to the mass of men, who wish to reconcile both worlds, she exhibits a purgatory, so far softened down by the masses of the priest and the prayers of the faithful, that its

fires can be anticipated without overwhelming dread." We are prepared to expect that some weak and ignorant persons may be seduced, by the bewitching fascinations of Popery, to submit themselves to that spiritual bondage and despotism which enslaved the souls and bodies of our forefathers, while it drained our country of its wealth ;* and from which, "through the tender mercies of our God," they (and we) were delivered in the sixteenth century by the blessed martyrs and confessors for the Reformation ; who, "counting not their lives dear unto them," suffered even unto death for the pure doctrines and holy moral precepts of the Gospel. So long, however, as our bishops and clergy continue faithful to the vows of God which are severally upon them—viz., that they shall "be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's word;" and to "teach the people committed to their charge nothing as required of necessity to eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, but that which they shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the holy Scriptures:"†—so long as they thus fulfil their high and holy commission, we need not fear the ultimate triumph of Popery in the British dominions. "If *we* 'cry aloud, and spare not,' against giving countenance to the unscriptural errors of Popery, we do so because it is our DUTY ; not with a view to excite animosities against the Papists, or to promote their antipathies against us ; but because we are not contending for trifles.....As Protestants, we are bound—from the king [queen] to the humblest of his [her] subjects—by an imperious duty, to the Reformation. If the Reformation *was* worth establishing, it *is* worth maintaining ; and it can only be maintained by constant vigilance in support of those principles which effected it in the sixteenth century."‡

* The sentiments of our forefathers concerning the rapacity of the Pope or Bishop of Rome, and his spiritual tyranny "upon the souls, bodies, and goods of all Christian people, excluding Christ out of his kingdom and rule of man's soul (as much as may be), and all other temporal kings and princes out of their dominions," are forcibly set forth at considerable length in the preamble to the statute 28 Hen. VIII., c. 10, entitled "An Act extinguishing the authority of the Bishop of Rome."

† Offices for the ordination of presbyters and for the consecration of bishops.

‡ Bishop Barrington's *Sermons and Charges*, pp. 436, 437.

ART. VII.—*Vigilantius and his Times.* By the Rev. W. S. GILLY, D.D., Canon of Durham, and Vicar of Norham. London: Seeleys. 1844.

NEVER, perhaps, did a book appear more seasonably, and better fitted for the times, than these sketches of some of the ecclesiastical worthies of the fourth century. It is a calm and well-digested sketch of a most interesting and important period of Church history; and opens out to us, in the story of a few individuals, the principles of that change, from the simplicity of the Gospel to the elaborate superstitions of the Papacy, which was most observable in the fourth century. Christianity had now become the religion of the State; and being no longer assailed by foreign violence, or weighed down by the arm of power, it externally presented a thriving and vigorous appearance. But the canker-worm was spreading its secret ravages within. In the unscrupulous ardour of the spirit of proselytism, the most unworthy means were adopted to multiply the disciples of the new religion. To conciliate Gentile prejudices, and to swell the number of Christian converts, who were such at least in outward form and semblance, whatever they might be in spirit and in truth, the rites and practices of heathenism were largely admitted into the bosom of the Christian Church, and by a gradual and fatal process "Christianity was Paganized in order to christen Paganism." The heart was the last place that was attacked, and consequently the last to yield; men who were heathens in principle became Christians in profession, and the standard of Christian holiness was brought down to the level of heathen practice.

During the third century a host of hermits and cenobites, whose austerities and self-inflicted torments the ignorant multitude mistook for piety, stood between the clergy and the people. Their possession of an almost unlimited influence, and their intrusive exercise of an *imperium in imperio*, the clergy could not brook with patience, and it behoved them to resort to similar means to secure the reverence and attachment of the laity. Priests, therefore, became monks, and monks were admitted into the priesthood; and asceticism and monachism were in the ascendant in the fourth century as much from policy as from choice. Men imperceptibly began to receive falsehood as truth; the Bible was gradually cast aside; marvellous tales of hermits and anchorites were progressively substituted for its holy teaching; and the Supreme Being was seen through such a mist of error, that instead of a merciful and gracious God, he was looked upon as a God of vengeance, delighting in the misery of his creatures.

In "Vigilantius and his Times" Dr. Gilly has touched upon some of the most important doctrines constituting the difference between the Reformed Churches and that of Rome, and has treated these subjects in a tone of seriousness and Christian charity that must excite the respect even of those who differ from him. The miracles of the fourth century; saint and relic worship; prayers to and for the dead; asceticism and celibacy, are considered with reference to the persons who, in connection with Vigilantius, figure in these pages. The causes and growth of superstitious practices are discussed with fairness and judgment; and we hope that the eyes of some may be opened to see the results of that teaching which has a tendency to revive, in our own days, the very practices which were opposed by Vigilantius fourteen hundred years ago.

Perhaps we cannot better recommend "Vigilantius and his Times" than by giving an outline of his history, even at the risk of doing much injustice to the author's style and language, by condensing his matter, while we cannot avoid employing his expressions. Vigilantius was born about A.D. 364, in the small village of Calagorris, now Houra, lying upon the northern side of the Pyrenees, on the great paved road leading from Aquitaine into Spain. His father was the keeper of the *mansio* or *station* at Calagorris, where travellers were provided with relays of horses and with guides for their journey; and to this his birth-place and his early occupation Vigilantius was probably indebted for the Christian bias of his mind and his first attainments in general knowledge; for at that period the communication between the distant provinces of the Roman empire was so safe and expeditious, that even the passage of the Alps and Pyrenees was an undertaking of perfect ease; and the son of the innkeeper, at the entrance of the mountain passes, would be frequently brought into close and familiar intercourse with the illustrious travellers who made his father's house their resting-place, and then took him as their guide across the mountains.

During the youth of Vigilantius several councils and synods were held (particularly those of Saragossa, in 380, and Bordeaux, in 384), which would afford him an opportunity of receiving instruction from some of the eminent ecclesiastics in their progress to and from Spain; but we have no account of his earliest religious impressions; and to Sulpicius Severus he was indebted for his decided conversion to Christianity. Vigilantius was taken into the service of Sulpicius about the year 390 as a "simple domestic;" he was then appointed to the superintendence of some of his master's estates in Spain, and

rom thence he was recalled to take up his abode under Sulpicius's own roof, at one of his villas in Aquitain. "Here he had every opportunity of improving his mind, and of mixing with the best literary and religious society of the province," which was at that time so rich in native genius and eloquence, that it was said to be "the flower, the ornament, and the glory of Gaul."

Sulpicius Severus was acknowledged by his contemporaries to be one of the most accomplished men of his age and country: "*vir genere et literis nobilis*." (Gennadius). "*Fori celebritate diversans, et facundi nominis palmam tenens*." (Paulini, Epist. I.)—*Vigilantius, &c.*, p. 35. Little is known of his character as a Christian until after the death of his wife, when he retired from worldly pleasures and pursuits under the hope that he should find consolation in the exercise of religious duties, and in the study of sacred literature. It was shortly after his retirement that Vigilantius entered his family, and, happily for himself, had an opportunity of witnessing the piety and well-directed talents of Sulpicius, before the lustre of both was dimmed by the breath of asceticism and superstition. "Sulpicius writing an abridgment of the Bible, and occupied daily in consulting and transcribing Scripture; Sulpicius endeavouring to imitate the first patterns of Christianity, feeding the hungry, visiting the sick, receiving the wanderer into his house, and regulating his whole life by evangelical precepts; Sulpicius building churches and promoting public and family worship; Sulpicius gathering about him the learned, the pious, and the wise, and discussing religious subjects; Sulpicius in the height of his fame, when everybody admired and loved him" (p. 136), was a guide to whom the docile, though enquiring mind of the youthful Vigilantius might be entrusted with implicit confidence. But the grief of Sulpicius soon sought for other relief than a patient waiting for the time when the same fatherly hand which had inflicted the wound should pour in the healing balm of heavenly consolation: he applied to St. Martin, of Tours, for advice and religious comfort; and Martin, instead of directing his thoughts and affections in a right channel, seems to have taught him to consider his affliction as a token of God's wrath for sins, for which he must make expiation by a life of the most rigid mortification and austerities. "Under the influence of Martin (says Dr. Gally), Sulpicius began to convert a household of faith into a scene of the grossest superstition: he denied himself the necessities of life, and he exhausted his strength by long fastings and devotional exercises, which lasted through the greater

part of the twenty-fours of every day: he tore his body with scourges, and invented new modes of self-punishment." When Sulpicius visited Martin, in the year 394, at his newly-formed monastery of Marmoutiers, it is not improbable that Vigilantius, who was admitted to the intimacy of a confidential friend, may have been the companion of his journey, and a witness of some of those pretended miracles which were afterwards related by Sulpicius in his "*Life of Martin*."

So strongly was the historian's fancy, on his returning home, impressed by what he had seen and heard, that Martin's miraculous gifts; Martin holding converse with evil spirits, and repelling them; receiving visits from angels and glorified saints; healing the sick; curing demoniacs; even raising the dead; became the constant theme of his conversation. "He was pursued by the recollection of the ascetic prelate sleeping on the cold earth with nothing but ashes beneath him, and covered with sackcloth only feeding on the most unwholesome food, and denying himself every indulgence, praying in the most irksome posture, forcing sleep from his eyes, and exposing himself to the extremes of heat and cold, and hunger and thirst" (p. 162); and he thought on all this until it became the object of his life to imitate the austerities of the Bishop of Tours. Doubtless, the mind of Sulpicius, weakened by grief, and solitude, and excitement, was as soil ready prepared for the seed sown in it by Martin; but not so the mind of Vigilantius, younger, happier, and accustomed to more active pursuits—imbued, too, with the scriptural knowledge which he could not have failed to acquire as the amanuensis and copyist of Sulpicius; we may easily suppose that he was not inclined to yield such easy belief to the marvellous tales related of Martin, nor yet to become one of his disciples. There would scarcely be a middle course left him to follow; he must either have blindly given himself up to the same delusions as his patron, or his eyes must have been opened to discern the folly and the danger of the system which Sulpicius was pursuing.

In the year 394, Vigilantius was sent into Campania as the bearer of letters to Paulinus of Nola. Paulinus was a native of Aquitain, but descended from a wealthy patrician family of Rome; he was the pupil and friend of Ausonius, and distinguished for his eloquence and literary acquirements—"he was loved, sought after, and respected by all the good men of his age, whether Christians or heathens." (Du Pin. p. 65). Grief for the death of his only son had led Paulinus to abandon all secular pursuits; and Nola, in Campania, was the chosen place of his retreat, because the remains of St. Felix, his patron saint,

were buried there. He had converted his villa, near the church of St. Felix, into a monastery, and gathered around him a number of devotees whom he formed into a fraternity of monks. From the tone of affectionate friendship in which Paulinus spoke of Vigilantius, after his arrival at Nola, we may conclude that the visit was only a renewal of former intimacy, and that Vigilantius had been acquainted with his host before he left Aquitaine; if so, the Gaul must have remarked the change wrought in him by the superstitious practices to which he was thus devoting himself.

We must refer the reader to the author's very graphic and interesting description of the villa at Nola, and the mode of life pursued there, and to the representation of the religious services, fastings, and penances, of which Vigilantius was a witness, and perhaps a partaker; but he saw more grievous errors than the excess of fasting and mortifications. Under the sanction of Paulinus other and worse superstitions were practised: he beheld preparations made for daily services in honour of a departed saint; he saw an ordained minister of Christ, who was at that time "consulted as the Christian oracle of Italy," and "visited by monks, clergy, and bishops, and even by laymen of the highest rank employing his time, wealth, and influence to promote the veneration of relics, invocation of the dead, prostration before pictures and statues, and other observances denounced as idolatrous in the holy page of the book of life." The conversation of Paulinus and his guests was but a tissue of marvellous tales, which they vied with one another in relating, to magnify the miraculous powers of their respective saints. Whatever impressions, however, the Gaul may have received from what he saw and heard in Italy, it does not appear that he expressed any dissatisfaction on the subject; for on leaving Paulinus he stood high in the good opinion of the recluse.

Vigilantius was ordained priest in the year 395, soon after his return from Nola, but apparently without being appointed to any parochial charge; and having succeeded to considerable wealth upon the death of his father, he resolved to undertake a journey to Palestine and Egypt, and again visit Paulinus on his way thither, with the object of obtaining from him letters of introduction to Jerome.

To Nola, therefore, he returned in 396, and found Paulinus sunk still deeper in the slough of superstition. His active and energetic mind required continual occupation and excitement; yet he had abandoned the social duties of life, by which the Father of all binds his children to one another, and all to him-

self. "He felt the curse of a dull void amidst all his long-promised charms of seclusion, and with feverish impatience he sought for new objects on which to fix his languishing attention; he dug for relics near home, and sent any distance for a rag or a bone which had the reputation of having belonged to a martyred Christian he listened to marvellous tales with the most implicit belief—no pretended miracle was too improbable for him he prostrated himself before the tomb of St. Felix, surrounded by pictures of saints and martyrs, till his mind and body being weakened by abstinence and watchings, he was persuaded that he saw supernatural sights and heard unearthly sounds" (p. 211); and then he argued that these signs and wonders were "proofs of the power of St. Felix, and that he ought to be invoked;" and that "heavenly blessings would reward those who should pray in his name, and implore his intercession." (p. 213). We can only refer to the heads of a chapter containing a most vivid account of the progress of idolatry at Nola, where the author tells us how the infatuated Paulinus, persuaded of the miraculous powers of St. Felix, instituted processions and ceremonies to his honour, and established an annual festival at Nola, which attracted crowds of votaries from all parts of Italy; how banquetings were held in the church itself; and that Paulinus, shocked at the consequent excesses of riot and immorality committed there, endeavoured to reform one abuse by the introduction of another, and accordingly decorated the walls of the church with pictures, "under the vain hope that they might instruct the riotous banqueters, and teach them purer morals and better manners." (p. 213). Vigilantius was present at the festival of Felix, and saw the worst species of idolatry practised under the direction of Paulinus himself. His subsequent proceedings only can give us any clue to his feelings at the time; but these proceedings afford sufficient ground for believing that he was enabled, by the power of God, to perceive the error of Paulinus, and compare the practice of the recluse with the spiritual lessons which he had received from his own lips.

From Nola, Vigilantius proceeded to Palestine, and hastened, to visit Bethlehem, where Jerome, to whom he was the bearer of a letter from Paulinus, was then living. The heart of a Christian must burn within him as he follows in imagination the steps of the traveller in the fourth century, descending the hill that shelters the birth-place of the Redeemer. We will not do injustice to Dr. Gilly's account of Bethlehem and its vicinity by attempting to condense it. Vigilantius saw and felt the solemn interest of the holy scene as he pursued his

way to the cell of Jerome; and the appearance of the monk must have jarred strangely with the feelings of one whose thoughts had been in unison with the objects around him, and had been fixed on the exceeding love of that Saviour whose birth at Bethlehem had brought "peace on earth, and good-will towards men." "He found Jerome clad in a vestment so coarse and sordid, that its very vileness bore the stamp of spiritual pride." (p. 236). "Long fasting, habitual mortification, and the chagrin which perpetual disputation occasions, had given an air of gloominess to his countenance" (p. 237); his whole appearance was indicative of the bodily sufferings he had imposed upon himself; whilst the brightness that shone from his keen eye told of that fiery and contentious spirit which was yet unquelled within. Verily, "bodily exercise profiteth little." It does not appear that much cordiality existed between Jerome and his Gallic visitor, notwithstanding the kindness of the monk, who afterwards appealed to Vigilantius to confirm his statement of "the avidity with which he had received him." Jerome's temper and conversation were so full of bitterness, intolerance, and acerbity, that they must have been most displeasing to Vigilantius, when contrasted with the gentle manners of his two Gallic friends, "who (says Dr. Gilly, in a spirit like their own) were full of the milk of human kindness, and whose errors were softened by the simplicity and unquestionable piety that marked all their words and actions." (p. 229).

But there was no such veil thrown over the errors of Jerome, and in his intercourse with that celebrated man, the mind of Vigilantius, unfettered by the ties of affection and gratitude, would be open to conviction, and he would be able to judge of principles and practices, not by the *men* who advocated them, but by the infallible and unchanging word of God. The more he saw of the ungentle spirit of his host, the more he would be inclined to question the efficacy and the expediency of all the rigid mortifications and austerities which constituted the *religion* of Jerome and his associates at Bethlehem. By chastisements of the flesh, he had indeed succeeded in bringing his body into subjection—but not his soul; that was still the seat of the most angry passions. His temper remained untamed—his tongue unbridled. Whilst he denied himself the common necessities of life—food, and rest, and cleanliness—he fancied he was making an acceptable sacrifice to God; he was satisfied with his asceticism and his continence. Here he stopped short; the sins of an unrenewed heart, the bitterness, wrath, clamour, and evil-speaking of which he was daily

guilty, were neither struggled against nor prayed against; and therefore Vigilantius saw little to love or to admire in him, whom at a distance he had revered as a saint and an oracle. The Christian community at Bethlehem, far from exhibiting that picture of peace and harmony that Vigilantius had been led to expect, was torn by dissensions. Jerome and his monks were quarrelling with, and refusing to yield obedience to, the bishop of the diocese; while disputes concerning the errors of Origen were dividing the Church and separating very friends. John, Bishop of Jerusalem, and Rufinus, had been accused by Jerome of holding the errors of Origen; whilst some of his own writings betrayed a leaning to the same opinions, and exposed him to the bitter retorts with which Rufinus did not hesitate to retaliate. It was during the heat of this controversy that Vigilantius left Bethlehem and repaired to Jerusalem, and there he visited Rufinus, whose conversation tended, perhaps, to strengthen the convictions which Jerome's own conduct had already produced in his mind. Speaking of Rufinus, the author remarks, in that spirit of truth and candour which is so much the characteristic of the work before us, "Rufinus, whatever may have been his theological errors and controversial asperity, was, like Jerome himself, a man whose purity of conduct, out of the polemical arena, was never questioned." (p. 292).

To Rufinus, Jerome imputes the first seeds of the quarrel between Vigilantius and himself; and probably the Gaul gave a willing ear to the complaints of Rufinus against the monk; for he returned to Bethlehem and to Jerome, prepared to resist his influence and to remonstrate with him. We can only judge of the nature of their discussion from Jerome's subsequent works, and from them it may be inferred that the Origenist question was the ground of the dispute. They parted in anger, and Vigilantius proceeded to Alexandria, and there "he pored over the subject with all the aid he could obtain, and imbibed such strong prejudices against Origen, that he began to think it was impious to read, much more to translate, that author." (p. 313).

From Alexandria he sailed for Europe, and landed in Italy, that he might convey letters to Paulinus at Nola, from thence pursuing his journey by land to his own country, at the foot of the Pyrenees. His route lay through that part of the Cottian Alps which was then the cradle, ere long perhaps to be the grave, of that faithful remnant of the primitive Church known by the name of Vaudois, or Waldensian. Dr. Gilly has adduced powerful, we might say incontrovertible arguments, to

prove that Vigilantius is a link connecting these mountain Christians of the fourth century, amongst whom he lingered, and to whom he declaimed against Jerome, "*inter Adriæ fluctus Cottique regis Alpes*," with the persecuted inhabitants of those secluded valleys in after ages. This is not a subject for present discussion; yet we cannot shrink from avowing our belief that the Gospel sun shone brightly on those valleys even in the earliest dawn of Christianity, and that there its light has never been obscured by the clouds of error and superstition which have darkened the world around. That God should keep alive his eternal truth in the hearts of his people, by the help of his Holy Spirit, without the aid of those means and ordinances which the pride of man thinks needful for the preservation of the pure word, is a thing hard to be believed by some, who have no hesitation in giving credence to the most marvellous tales of healing and life-giving power imparted to mouldering bones and decomposed human flesh. Vigilantius probably found clergy in that mountain region holding the same opinions as himself. Ambrose mentions some, in the secluded parts of his patriarchate, who refused, on the plea of ancient custom, to submit to the yoke of celibacy; and Jerome exclaims against the bishops who were partakers in Vigilantius's crime! At all events, he would there be able to give free utterance to the thoughts engendered by the unchristian temper and superstitions which he had witnessed during his sojourn in the East.

After his return to his country he retired to Calagorris, and there prepared himself by study to encounter his formidable adversary; and it was not till two years after his visit to Bethlehem that he put forth his attack upon Jerome, in which he accused that father of heterodoxy on the Origenist question. Jerome's reply was bitter and sarcastic, taunting Vigilantius with his obscure origin, whilst at the same time it informs us that he spent his time in study, that he had transcripts of Origen's works, that he read both Greek and Latin authors, that he employed scribes and copyists, and that he studied the Scriptures, which Jerome thought ill-suited to his former occupation. After this epistle, which had no reference to the opinions subsequently avowed by Vigilantius, we hear nothing of him till the year 404, when a complaint was lodged against him with Jerome, by Riparius, a priest in the diocese of Tholouse; and again in the following year, Riparius, in conjunction with Desiderius, another priest in the same diocese, appealed a second time to Jerome, and sent him a copy of Vigilantius's writings. Jerome's letter to Ripar-

rius in 404, and his Treatise against Vigilantius in 406, contain all the information we possess respecting the opinions propagated by the Reformer; and we will give a summary of them in Dr. Gilly's own words:—

“Jerome's book against Vigilantius contained the worst that could be said of him. In it we may be assured that we have the accuser's brief before us, with the sum and substance of all he had to advance against the Reformer of Aquitain; and we can confidently affirm that Vigilantius had done nothing worthy of being branded as a heretic or a blasphemer. Not a word is alleged in proof of his having spoken or written against any of the articles of the Apostles' Creed, or against a single point of doctrine or discipline which the concurrent voice of Scripture and tradition had proclaimed to be essential to Christianity. The utmost that we can extract from the indictment is, that he stigmatized as idolatrous and unscriptural the *adoring* homage paid to the relics and tombs of the martyrs by their superstitious votaries—that he objected to prayers for and to the dead—that he repudiated the yoke of celibacy imposed on the clergy—dissuaded from sending alms to Jerusalem—and questioned the merits of asceticism.” (pp. 454, 455).

In some part of Dr. Chalmers' voluminous writings there is a passage, if we remember correctly, in which, arguing in favour of the cathedral dignities of the Established Church, he observes, that “whenever the welfare of our Zion has been threatened either by the open assaults of infidelity, or by the insidious encroachments of superstition, there has always stepped forth some able champion, cased in the panoply of truth, and armed with choice weapons drawn from the stores of sacred literature, ready to do battle in behalf of the Church of Christ.” And nobly has Dr. Gilly discharged *his* duty as a warrior in the Christian cause; encountering the enemy on their own position, wresting from them the vantage-ground which they had chosen, and routing them in utter discomfiture from the field. Would that such champions were multiplied to the Lord's people an hundred-fold! Then would the high purposes for which those repositories of ecclesiastical learning were designed be amply fulfilled; and not even from the most envious members of our communion would a single voice be lifted up, or the faintest murmur heard, against the continuance of those rich endowments.

ART. VIII.—*Memoranda of Irish Matters, by Obscure Men of Good Intention.* Dublin: S. J. Machan. 1844.

2. *Speech of Viscount Bernard, M.P., on Mr. Ward's Motion in the House of Commons, August 2, 1843.* London: Hatchards. 1844.

3. *Ireland before and after the Union with Great Britain.* By R. M. MARTIN, Esq. London: Orr and Co. 1844.

4. *The Truths of Protestantism Contrasted with the Errors of Popery; and the Character of Popery, as illustrated in Past and Present Times.* Glasgow: M'Phun. 1837.

5. *How will Peel treat Ireland?—an Address to the Catholics of Ireland.* By VERUS. London: Painter. 1844.

THE man who sits down to calculate and write an almanac possesses an immense advantage over him who undertakes to convey his thoughts, speculations, or experience to the public upon matters connected with Ireland. The former may, at least, enjoy the pleasant conviction that his ruminations and his labours will preserve their freshness and effect for one entire year; but the writer upon Irish affairs may find all his toil useless, and his speculations old, ere the ink has dried upon his manuscript. Write as rapidly or as thoughtfully as he may, his sentiments, when published, may be of less value than an almanac, not of the present, but of the past year. Events, circumstances, plans, and plots are so constantly shifting, progressing, and varying, that before one set of them may be described they have already lived their little day, and become objects of history, rather than of speculation. New events have already happened; other circumstances have arisen; an entire change of plans has been adopted; and novel plots have thrown the old ones into oblivion. The convicted leaders of rebellion are one day consigned to their well-merited punishment by a large majority of the judges of the land, and the next they are restored to liberty and mischief by a small majority of lords of the law, all Whigs; and, of course, without the slightest suspicion of being in the least degree swayed by political bias.

But if the events, circumstances, plans, and plots connected with Ireland are ever varying, and assuming new features and spheres of action, the condition of Ireland herself is, in one sense, stationary. While other nations may be compared to gallant and richly-freighted vessels making their way over the ocean of life, acquiring wealth by their commercial enterprise, or enjoying their dignity by enterprise achieved, Ireland is like a sunken ship, with only her tops above the wave, designating

the spot where she is not. From the fair surface of that ocean on which she was so eminently calculated to hold a proud and an imposing position, Ireland has been dragged to the bottom by the irresistible power and weight of political Popery. There she lies, fast bound in chains that defy her attempts to rise; and there the noble and richly-charged argosy is the victim of a crew of conspirators, who, under the pretence that they can raise her unscathed to the surface, to take her place once more among her sister barks, are rifling her of her richest treasures, and fattening on their ill-got plunder. Their efforts to raise the noble ship are made without honest concert or skilful science. The only means for success are disregarded or unknown; the sunken hull is, in detached parts, blown into fragments; and as the pieces of the old wreck are driven to the surface, they are greedily seized by the mob watching for them, and carried off as part and parcel of that rich old freight—the nationality of Ireland.

But before we proceed any further, let us at once admit a great, a startling, and perhaps, to many of our readers, an unexpected truth. England has *not* done justice to Ireland! England has inflicted a positive, grievous, and deadly wrong upon that country; and England owes full compensation, though she has endured a full and bitter measure of punishment, for the justice she has withheld and the evil she has inflicted. For the sins of omission as well as of commission—for the negative as well as the positive injury, reparation is due, as retribution has been felt. Years back was Ireland branded, by our ancestors, with the burning stamp which has seared her very bones; and now the sins of the forefathers are heavily, and not unjustly, visited upon the children. What this injustice and foul wrong were we will now briefly explain. By the commission of them we committed a heavy sin; by their continuation we did what irreligious statesmen would deem infinitely worse—we committed a gross political blunder.

There was a time when the claim of Ireland to her title of the "Isle of Saints" was not alone undisputed, but well maintained and deservedly conceded. How soon or by what mysterious means the winged seeds of the fairest flower that ever bloomed and gave beauty to the earth, were wafted to her green and fertile shores, is only known to us through the medium of poetical tradition and graceful legend.* But story and song are em-

* St. Colman, defending the Church of Ireland against the innovations of that of Rome, says—"We abide by the custom of our fathers, which was given to us by Polycarp, the disciple of St. John." And "here we may observe (adds the Dean of Ardagh, in his history) the apostolic succession

balmed in the spirit of truth ; and of this we are certain, that the Christianity which sprung humbly at Bethlehem, and was exalted at Calvary, was the pure and primitive Christianity which, meeting obstacles by the way, only to lightly surmount them, passed over other lands where it found a home ; but after struggles against persecution and sealings of martyrdom, and lighting on the shores of Erin, deposited its seed, and was straightway a tall and goodly tree. Beneath the branches and under the shadow of that tree reclined all the virtues, made brighter by Faith, and more radiant by Hope. Peace was there universal and undisturbed. Love there dwelt and spread its gentle influences. There Charity was active ; and *there* were found that wisdom and that science which made the far island of the West as renowned for its sages as for its saints ; and which, based upon Christianity, were only exercised for the glory of God and the benefit of man. The light of truth shone high upon the rock of Ireland over a wide and tumultuous sea of heathenism and barbarity rolling in thunder around. That light was a beacon which guided many a half-drowned and fainting struggler through the waves of doubt or infidelity to a haven of faith and security ; and from that beacon was fired many a torch which carried back the illumining wisdom of Christianity to lands yet covered with the veil of darkness and torn by the violence of savages. That flame gave a glorious increase of light, and warmth, and splendour to all who sought of it, nor suffered itself a diminution. Nay, it gained by what it gave ; imparting the means of immortality to others, and every hour more meriting its own. That beacon might still have been shedding its saving light above the world's waters, but for those who rudely extinguished it. It was England who committed this rash act, and is now reaping its necessary consequences. It was England that tossed the fair and guiding flame into the dark and hissing waves that roared beneath it, and in its place erected the false and destructive beacon of Political popery. From that hour has the fair and ancient reputation of Ireland perished. She may have had

of the Irish Church clearly pointed out : St. John the Evangelist ; Ignatius, the immediate disciple of St. John ; Polycarp, the disciple of Ignatius ; Pothinus, Irenæus, and others, the disciples of Polycarp, who preached the Gospel with great success in Gaul, through whose means flourishing Churches were established in Lyons and Vienne, of which Pothinus was the first bishop. From thence the Gospel sounded forth through all that country. Bishops Lupas and German, the descendants of these holy men, ordained St. Patrick, and made him chief bishop of their school among the Irish ; and from St. Patrick, to the present day, we have a regular succession of bishops, not from Rome, nor through Rome, but through the successors of the Apostle John, the patron of the Irish Church."—*Dean of Ardagh's History*, p. 29, cited by Lord Bernard, in his *Speech in the House of Commons*, on Mr. Ward's motion.

her passing, as her individual glories; but her old renown fell at once and for ever. She ceased to be the observed of all observers; no longer, and never again, was she the cynosure of the entire world. The brightest jewel on the brow of Christendom was ground into the dust; and since that day the isle of sages and of saints has been famed only for its folly and unrighteousness. The teacher of Christendom has become its reproach; she is a bye-word among nations. For the wisdom that, wherever existing, Ireland was acknowledged as its home, we see now every absurdity attributed to the same source. For the love that reigned we have violence usurpingly enthroned. For Christian charity we behold the most fiend-like passions. Prosperity is not lasting with her, nor through her. She is constantly wrecking the remnant of her own fortunes and ours; and, in short, is the rock of divine vengeance, against which the peace and the welfare of England have been repeatedly dashed into glittering fragments.

The land which was never trodden by the invading foot of a Roman soldier was made desolate by the presence of a Romish priest. In its pristine heathenism, Ireland, like all other barbarous countries, was as ignorant as it was rude, and was distinguished for those vices which are sure to flourish where education is not known and restraining laws do not exist. Rapine, violence, and every source of domestic convulsion, tore the land, before primitive Christianity established itself there in peace, and brought with it the arts of social life, as well as the means of heavenly. Murder, robbery, and general wrong as nearly disappeared as they can upon a guilty earth disappear, under the early dispensation, only to rise and flourish with new vigour under the latter dispensation of Popery—ever among its teachers fair and false—with loyalty on its lips and treason at its heart—sleek on the surface and corrupt at the core.

The types of the religion that was and the religion that is; the faith which aided peace and that which helps sedition; the belief which taught obedience to the powers that be, and that which, while professing it, urges to sedition and murder through the ribald songs of the *Nation* newspaper, and directs obedience, seemingly, to the English throne, but actually to the Vatican; the type of the old pure faith and that of the impure one which has been suffered to supplant it, may be well seen in those round towers of other days which have so long puzzled the learned, and in the modern Popish emblem of the broken pillar which has been permitted to intrude itself into even Protestant burial-grounds. The mystery which for so many years enshrouded the solitary pillars, like those of Clondalkin, Antrim,

Trummery, and others, has been solved by the discovery of human bones buried at their base. They are, without doubt, pillars of memorial and meaning, raised as were the stones and pillars of the East,* not only in memory of an event, but significant of a truth; not alone to tell of a departure, but to remind of immortality; at once with its base in the earth, a sign of death, and with its point to the heavens, an emblem of resurrection. Such was the pious faith, and these pillars the proof of it, in the primitive Christians of Ireland. But these mute fingers pointing to the skies are no longer emblems of the hereafter in Romanist countries. Popish ingenuity has discovered and restored a favourite symbol of heathenism; the broken pillar, as a hieroglyphic, if we may use the term, of death, is now universal in Popish countries, and has even crept into those club burial-grounds where all faiths, and none, find a welcome grave. We repeat, that these symbols well interpret the spirit of the parties who have invented or adopted them. The primitive Christianity of Ireland is well rendered in the upright and majestic simplicity of the pointed column. The unsatisfactoriness of Popery is equally well symbolized in the broken pillar of its adoption, showing how great its tendency to earth, and how far it falls off from heaven.

As we have said, we inflicted Popery upon Ireland. An English Bishop of Rome gave the fair land, that was not his to give, to the English crown; and that English sovereign, Henry II., whom Cardinal Vivian has handed down to everlasting infamy, as one whose equal in lying was never seen upon earth, introduced the mother of desolation into the conquered country, and held the country itself rather as lord paramount than as actual territorial sovereign. Indeed, the political as well as the religious authority—the claim to the soil itself, as well as to the consciences of the men upon it, has never been abandoned by the Popes. They once claimed it, and they have never formally foregone their claim. They do not at present assert it, but they have not on that account abandoned it. The title of the present possessor is undisputed for the moment, but it will be denied without scruple when opportunity is ripe for it. Henry II. himself acknowledged what the court of Rome described as admitting of no doubt—viz., “that Ireland, and all the islands on which Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, hath shone, do belong to the patrimony of St. Peter and the Holy

* “And Rachel died and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem. And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave: that is the pillar of Rachel’s grave until this day.” (Gen. xxxv. 19, 20).

Roman Church." The people of Ireland were instructed, therefore, to receive the English sovereign honourably, and as their lord, *saving always* the rights of the churches, and reserving unto St. Peter his well-known annual tax. In 1175, the synod of Irish bishops held at Waterford denounced the severest censures of the Church against all who should presume to impeach the donation of their country which the Roman Pontiff had made to the King of England. This circumstance, standing alone, would prove that those primitive Christians of Ireland whom the Popes stigmatized with the appellations of filthy and barbarous—for no other reason, as it would seem, than that they were not yet subjects of the Romish see—did among themselves deny the religious supremacy of the Romish Church, and its power to make over an independent country to an invader, alien certainly in blood and in religion. But the circumstance is not solitary; and from another we learn that the civil supremacy of the same Church must have been equally denied, seeing that the Irish bishops found it expedient to denounce fearful pains and penalties against those who should dare to impeach or oppose the governing authority with which the English monarch had been invested under the title of "Lord of Ireland." That country was indeed conquered by Anglo-Norman forces, for the Pope, and by the Pope's order. Neither Henry nor any of his successors ever received the title of King of Ireland, or were authorized to assume it. Henry VIII. took it of his own free will and action, and was denounced for that, as well as for his other imputed crimes against Rome. Ireland was regarded and treated by the Pope as belonging to *the royalties of St. Peter*, or a part of that saint's patrimony, which the King of England was to govern as long as he acknowledged a feudal superior in the Pope.* That superiority, that civil and temporal supremacy,

* "The Irish nobles and princes, not those of the pale wholly, but of the whole country, at once arrayed themselves (after Henry VIII. had come to an open rupture with the Pope) on the side of the Crown; and, to escape from priestly tyranny, were ready to seek shelter, even at the expense of all their national prejudices and antipathies, under the wing of the English monarch. Desmond, O'Neil, O'Bryan, O'More, O'Rourke, M'Donnel, De Burgos—in short, all the great chiefs whose names are familiar to the student of Irish history, hastened to enter into indentures with Henry, binding themselves utterly to deny, and promising to forsake the usurped primacy and authority of the Bishop of Rome, and engaged to assist to suppress the same, and all that should by any means uphold or maintain it. And although the Papal Government were urging every means to guard against this alienation of St. Peter's patrimony—having denounced the king, and doomed him 'to eternal curse and damnation'—having issued peremptory orders to the bishops to administer to the people, in confession, an oath of allegiance to the Pope '*in all things spiritual and temporal*'—having hurled curses against all who should acknowledge Henry's claims, and afforded indulgences to all those who should oppose him—having indeed expended

is still tacitly claimed by Rome. The spiritual supremacy Rome fully and publicly enjoys. If the civil and temporal supremacy do not follow, it will not be the fault of those three law lords who, despite the decision of a vast majority of the English and Irish judges to the contrary, overthrew a judgment, the carrying out of which would have given breathing time to Ireland, but the setting aside of which will help Mr. O'Connell and his friends to agitate that unhappy country, and keep her in turbulence and distraction, till the time comes for making a claim to that temporal and territorial supremacy which the Pope longs to establish, and does not despair to effect.

Before we pass from this part of our subject we cannot refrain from noticing a curious fact, that deserves to be more extensively known than it is—viz., that Mr. O'Connell is himself, by descent, not Irish, but Norman. Our readers know, what we have had occasion to mention elsewhere, how often he boasts of his pure Celtic blood:—

“Falso, sed credentibus, nuntiat.”

He is for ever, not with Milesian, but true Norman instinct, railing at the Saxons—the victims, and not the “blood-thirsty oppressors,” as he would have his credulous hearers believe, of his own faction; while he himself is the descendant of a mere mercenary Norman invader, whose name (“Connel”) may be seen at this day on the roll at Battle Abbey, among those who, under a banner blessed by the Pope, and a leader cursed by God and man, came into England, with lips full of promise and hearts full of murder. To this fact, of his name being on the list of invaders at Hastings, we will only add, for the satisfaction of those who may be inclined to doubt it, that it is narrated on no less an authority than that of Thierry, the historian of the Norman conquest, whose sympathies are entirely with Mr. O'Connell, and whose antipathies, like those of many of his prejudiced countrymen, are as entirely directed against England and the English.*

the whole resources of the Vatican—it was found to be in vain. So thoroughly were the Irish chiefs and people wearied and disgusted with the hierocracy, that not a sword was drawn in their quarrel.”—*Truths of Protestantism compared with the Errors of Popery*. Glasgow, M'Phun, 1837.

“The invaders of Ireland, as well as all who ever gained anything by the invasion, were pure Norman robbers—men of the same blood and stock as the conquerors of Northern France and of England; the scurvy condition of some of whom is betrayed by their names. Such is that of *Raymond le Pauvre*, who, without changing his appellation of *the poor*, or *the penniless*, became a high and mighty baron in the east of Ireland, and whose descendants are to this day known in the Le Poers, and Powers, that are scattered about the country.”—*Church and State Gazette*, No. 99.

It has been over and over again proved, that after the primitive Christianity of Ireland was driven out by Popery, that country suffered a deterioration in its learning, its piety, and its heroism. The schools and colleges of Ireland became deserted. Her priests, who were wont to teach foreign pupils, were themselves the disciples of foreign masters. The great authors disappeared, and were not renewed. Ecclesiastical writers of the Popish period fed superstition by penning legends of imaginary saints. The mere priests, who could not aspire even to such authorship as that, were too ignorant even to pronounce correctly the Latin words of the mass. And the art of printing, though known for nearly a century before the British Reformation was accomplished, was never suffered to enter Ireland so long as Popery was supreme. We are told, that preaching constituted no part of the clerical office, and that the high sanctions of religion and morality were superseded by the mere terrors of bodily penances. Sir James Ward cites a case, towards the close of the twelfth century, of one hundred and forty of the clergy of a single diocese being at one time convicted of incontinence. The indications, indeed, of the general profligacy of the clergy during a long period are fearful, but we will not continue to allude to them. To imitate a writer who uses this quaint expression of Archbishop Usher, when illustrating some of the abominations of the Irish nunneries, we "shall stir the puddle no further." We will only add, in proof of a deterioration in heroism and in the patriotic virtues of the Irish people subsequent to the Papal invasion, as it has been well called, that Dr. Doyle, himself a Romanist priest, thus describes the character and condition of the people at the period alluded to. He, of course, ascribes it to English domination, and cannot see that Papistry has any connection with it whatever. So far, we disagree as to causes, but we are satisfied to take his own view of the manners and situation of the Irish people, leaving our readers to make their own conclusions, while we are also perfectly aware that they will make the right ones. "The nation (says Dr. Doyle, *I. K. L. Vindication*, p. 7), which was thus enslaved, put on all the habits which had been formed for them—they became ferocious; individually brave, but cowards when collected together; cunning, astute, cruel; strangers to honesty and truth." In citing this, we must be permitted so far to interfere with the conclusions our readers may be prepared to make, by stating, that the people thus described, with the exception of those of six Irish counties, denominated the pale, were free of all English rule; the sins and the miseries of the Irish cannot, therefore, be charged to the oppression of a political

power whose sway was often bounded by the very walls of Dublin, but, as we think, to that religious authority which ruled and abused the entire land.

And assuredly, if the priesthood in general were corrupt, neither were individual virtues very manifest in any of those sacerdotal Lord-Lieutenants to whom the Government, lay and spiritual, of Ireland, was entrusted at various periods between the nomination of the first viceroy, Richard Strongbow, down to the epoch of the Reformation, when the vicereignty was held by the Kildares, Fitzgeralds, Surreys, and Ormonds of the day. The first ecclesiastic who exercised a deputed sovereign authority in Ireland was the Archbishop of Cashel, who was succeeded by the Archbishop of Dublin, and both of whom occupied the viceregal chair during the reign of Edward the Second. Roger Outlaw, the prior of Kilmainham, enjoyed the same position under Edward the Third; after whom no priest was elevated to the deputyship of Ireland till the reign of Henry the Fourth, when Prior Butler was at the head of the administration, acting, however, for the Duke of Lancaster. In the following reign, Crawley, Archbishop of Dublin, had the vicereignty conferred upon him. Under Henry the Sixth we find an Archbishop of Armagh entrusted with the direction of the Irish Government; and again, under Henry the Seventh, Walter, Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishop of Bangor, were invested with the same heavy responsibilities. Those were the only Romanist priests who ever enjoyed the high dignity of viceroys of Ireland, and how they upheld or disgraced that dignity let history tell; we will be satisfied with affirming generally, that the country was never so ill-governed as when subjected to their sway. Since the Reformation, supreme authority in Ireland has only once been given to an ecclesiastic, in the person of Loftus, Bishop of Dublin, who was made Lord-Lieutenant by Elizabeth. Since that time, it has been rightly considered that a trust of this nature was not suitable to the ministers of Christ; their sphere of usefulness was in another and a better field; and, consequently, no ecclesiastical dignitary has ever held sway in Ireland since the time of Elizabeth, except in the absence of a viceroy, whose delegated authority he may have partially enjoyed as one of the Lords Justices.

We are not going to inflict our tediousness upon our readers in even a brief detail of the course of political events in Ireland from the period of the Reformation to the present day. It will suffice to say, that from that period down to the present startling one, which has seen Mr. O'Connell liberated from his well-merited incarceration by the extraordinary means of a *minority*

of the judges, there has been a sustained, active, vigilant, and determined conspiracy against the integrity of the empire, against the Protestant religion, and against England and everything connected with her. From the very first the cry of the factious was, "*Ireland for the Irish!*"—a cry which, however seemingly honest and reasonable, was significant of as much rebellious treason as could be conceived or executed. This cry was first raised when the Romanists in Ireland possessed at least as much, if not more, liberty than they do now; when they had a House of Commons with a Romanist majority; and when Romanist peers were members of the Council. The Irish demagogues began, continued, and still perform their vocation, not merely by inciting the people to rebel, but by inviting, welcoming, aiding, and abetting foreign invasion. They commenced by sending for San Josepho, and they have not yet ended, by giving hints to the Popish Prince de Joinville. The first invasion, during the reign of Elizabeth, was made under the name of the Pope (claiming the territorial sovereignty of Ireland), though at the expense of Spain. The religious prejudices of the people were worked upon then, as they are now; they were taught to look upon a Spanish invasion with favour, as the traitorous Popish press of our own day is teaching its disciples to be familiar with a French one. It ended, as may all such end, save in its attendant cruelties, in the utter discomfiture of those who made and those who had joined in it. But Popery is hydra-headed and tenacious, and is maimed but to be stirred to action, rather when subdued to quiescence. The brief space of score of years had scarcely elapsed when—as acute at finding a grievance as the editors of the *Nation*, who almost discern one in Mr. O'Connell's release—they discovered that they were grievously oppressed by the introduction into their country of *trial by jury*. They declared the boon a curse, for the sole purpose of raising sedition by its means. Even so; but a few short weeks ago the United Parliament of the empire conferred one of the greatest benefits upon Ireland that she has ever experienced since the Union. But mark what conciliation effects for the loyal and reasonable leaders of a deluded and ignorant people. The boon of trial by jury was acknowledged, on the side of the Irish, by the welcome which they gave to the invasion of D'Aquila in 1600; the benefit conferred upon them by the Charitable Bequests Bill of last session is repaid, on the part of the Romanist repealers, by their inviting an invasion from the French, and promising, by *intendo*, to further its success. Again, in the reign of Charles the First, when an indulgence, amounting to toleration, was extended to all Romanists,

and security of tenure also extended to them for the possessions which they retained, they, at the very moment when peace was most desirable, most expected, most easy to be maintained, and least suspected of being interrupted, committed a ruthless slaughter of the English, in which kin and stranger, personal friend and political foe, old and young, helpless man, defenceless woman, and cradled child, were all slain in a massacre, which, for diabolic invention of cruelty and refinement of torture, would shame the demons themselves. We have no purpose of inflicting either insult or sorrow by recalling the heavy sins of those past days; we doubt not that the general mass of the Irish people are as innocent of all intention of rising to massacre, as they are of giving approbation to the slaughter. The progress of time has done a great deal for them, but nothing for their leaders. If the people are not assassins, it is no fault of their teachers through the press. The *Nation* has repeatedly urged its dupes to become murderers, or its scarcely veiled inuendoes are void of meaning. Its allusions to Saxons and blood, to the Irish and the gleaming knife, to bosoms to be pierced, and to weapons ready to thrust, convey to us impressions which, while we would fain believe them to be unfounded, interpret those scarcely dark hints as saying to their readers, "the knife is in your hand, and the victim at your feet—smite him!"

We know we shall be met by the assertion, that the lately enlarged Liberator is a man who, though not entirely free from blood-guiltiness, yet who holds blood-shedding in abhorrence. This, too, we are willing to believe. But, at the same time, we must be permitted to remind our own readers, that the latter gentleman, during the whole course of a brief imprisonment, which law and reason concurred in saying he deserved, but from which a combination of events, whose true history will not be unveiled for many a long day, has so recently released him, sanctioned the murderous threats of the *Nation*; because, knowing the influence he can exercise, and the authority with which he is invested, certain we are that he had but to express a wish that these helps to assassination should cease, and he would have been obeyed. But no such wish was ever expressed. Mr. O'Connell somewhat pompously inveighed against a rising of the people that should lead to the spilling of Irish blood, while he tacitly permits the circulation of helps to destroy Saxon life. What would we infer from this? Assuredly, not that he is thirsting for that destruction, but rather that he cares little for it—in short, that he is totally free from the imputation of honest sincerity; and if we required but one single additional link to the chain of evidence necessary to convince us fully that he may

fairly wash his hands of the charge of being oppressed with the sincerity he would fain persuade the world he possesses, we could at once find it in the fact, that while, for political, and perhaps for better than political, purposes, he has trained the great majority of the lower orders of his followers into the adoption and observance of teetotalism, and while he at the same time has been repeatedly heard to boast that he too, *blessed be God*, was a teetotaler—we say that it is sufficient impeachment of his general sincerity to find this man at one moment publicly thanking God as having renounced every sort of stimulating beverage, and in the next, see him in Richmond Penitentiary, receiving hampers of champagne; while what may be called his own newspapers make the interesting notification to the world, that that peculiar production is the favourite wine of the Liberator, and that *Oeil de Perdrix* is to O'Connell what *Chambertin* was to Napoleon. Verily, if the master of Derrynane would avoid the charge of hypocrisy, he should refrain from exhorting against slaughter, while he sanctions the *Nation's* pointings to murder; and renounce champagne at the moment he is thanking the Almighty that, with regard to wine and strong drinks, he is as abstemious as a Rechabite.

And again, Mr. O'Connell's loyalty, though an object of much and very obtrusive laudation with himself, is altogether, both with those who know him well, and those who can judge of him only by his public acts, not at all a matter that is either above, or that is able to defy, suspicion. At what *can* the lip-loyalty of a political leader be estimated, when his followers, and the printed organs of his opinions, are deluging the country with stimulants to sedition? It was no sooner intimated that the Queen was about to visit that "still vexed" portion of her dominions—Ireland—than the entire Irish Repeal press, from Antrim to Cork, poured forth, not absolute threats to prevent the Royal visit, but significant intimations that it would neither be received with pleasure nor turned to the advantage of peace. The people were instructed to abandon the route by which her Majesty should travel, or otherwise to witness her passage in ungracious silence; or if their throats *did* long to shout, to give utterance to nothing but screams for the repeal of the union. These instructions were made publicly, and without shame—how they may have been bettered by private teaching, *they* know best who are in the habit of drilling the people to destruction.

But however the case may be in this respect, the disloyalty of the leaders of the movement was a thousand times more significant when the booming of the cannon before Tangier first reached the Irish shores. They were in ecstasies, and their

fond imaginations already saw Bantry Bay covered with a triumphant French fleet. Mr. O'Connell may not have suggested the sedition that was spouted forth on this occasion, but again he added to sedition the important weight of his sanction. What was the treason awakened by the bombardment of Tangier compared to that which became frantically rampant at the fall of Mogadore? The treachery before only hinted at was now openly advised. The hour of England's need was exultingly proclaimed to have arrived; and that hour had long before been pronounced to be that of Ireland's vengeance. Yet all this time Mr. O'Connell looked, calmly exulting, on the threatened conflict. He saw, or at least he knew, that in the dastardly menaces of the repeal press, a hundred thousand knives were brandished at Protestant breasts; but he uttered no word of counsel, nor moved an arm to put them aside. The people were taught to look upon France as a friend—on England as a foe; to consider Ireland as an usurped addition to the British crown; and to view their own independence as attainable through an insurrection from within and an invasion from without. No expression of displeasure or dissent escaped from the lips of him to whom those writers acknowledged unlimited subjection and an unhesitating obedience. On the contrary, not alone stringent prose, but stimulating measures in verse, were applied to rouse the people to rebellion, or to keep the necessity of it before their eyes. Former invasions, or attempted invasions, were sung of as triumphs only wanting a little present exertion of heart and hand to carry forward to perfection, and to establish for ever. The glories of Quiberon were scoffed at, and Thurot raised to a stature of heroism which the Prince de Joinville was about to more than emulate. Conflans was trumpeted forth as a name to be remembered—that of a warrior who was leading a hostile armament to invade and destroy heretical England. But the fate of Conflans, by the arm of God, and through the instrumentality of Hawke, was not exalted enough for the poetic strains of Popery. The *Soleil Royal* would have formed the admirable staple of rebel rhymes, had she not been unfortunately rendered more unmanageable than Horace's "Equotuticum"* for verse, by the victorious and avenging thunders of the *Royal George*.

All the by-gone threatened invasions of Spain and France

* "Quatuor hinc rapimus viginti et millia rhedis,
Mansuri oppidula, quod versu dicere non est."

Sat. v. lib. 1.

were, moreover, revealed to the listening but mystified people of Ireland, as occurrences that were hailed and aided by the entire Irish population. The retailers of falsehood never deemed it worth their while, or necessary, for decency's sake, to inform them, that they were only hailed by a minority of factious and impoverished men, who, having nothing to lose by a national convulsion, hoped for the chance of falling upon something to gain by it. They confined themselves to pointing out that dissatisfaction existed among the lowest populace of Dublin, and compared the heavings of society then, with those which have attended the course of the present agitation. That there were loyal hearts and brave men, whose courage was ready for action in behalf of the Throne and the Church, were matters of too trifling a nature to be deemed worthy of notice. The great object was to represent England always in odious colours, and Ireland always in a position of hostility against her; to demonstrate that the former country was now more odious than ever, and the latter more powerful to avenge herself of her rival. Such things as these were indeed honoured with more than the sanction of Mr. O'Connell. Many similar misrepresentations originated entirely with himself. His so-called "History of Ireland" is the most flagrant illustration of lying legendary composition that we ever met with. When the master so exemplifies his own ideas of what is due in the matter of the sacred observance of truth, we need no longer feel wonder, and scarcely indignation, at the way in which truth is abused by those to whom the task is entrusted of seducing the people from their allegiance. We need not be surprised at the facility with which they metamorphose history into romance, or be astonished to see them employed in filtering hard facts into slippery fictions. It is natural to find these men making an invincible hero of Hoche, a demi-god of Humbert,* and a triumphant admiral of Villaret Joyeuse; contrasting the fifteen thousand men of the first, and the splendid fleet of the last, with the increased force and the larger armament that might be derived from France now, if Ireland would but ask for it. The hostile navy of two French admirals sail from Brest in goodly rhymes, but no verse tells how a Power greater than theirs swept the more numerous portion of the ships from the face of the deep. Admiral Bouvet bounds into Bantry Bay in iambics, but not even doggrel is devoted to the telling how he

* There was something of the honest virtue of simplicity about Humbert which never allowed him to comprehend the meaning of the French invasion of Ireland. "We have been knocking Popery to pieces in Italy (said the unsophisticated warrior), and here we are protecting her in Ireland. We kill it in one place, and we help it to its legs in another!"

got out again ;—the one great object being, as we have said, to familiarize the people with the idea of a French invasion, and to accustom them to expect its future triumph, by delineating those that have passed rather as the projectors wished them to terminate, than as Providence permitted them to fall out.

The whole course of the eventful story of the late proceedings in Ireland—we mean the acts which gave rise to the State prosecutions, the subsequent trials, conviction, appeals, and reversal of judgment—all these have been so recently under the notice of our readers, that it will not be necessary to do more than refer to them generally. We all know the dexterity with which Mr. O'Connell fences with the law ; we are all aware how nearly he can verge upon treason without incurring personal risk—nay, more, we have but too recently experienced how he can commit sedition, be convicted of the crime, and yet find escape from the consequences. For years he has been, by his agitating, keeping British capital from Ireland—capital that, skilfully employed, would have raised the country to a better equality than any she is likely to obtain either by legislation or rebellion ; for years he has been the terror of capitalists who would have scattered wealth among his countrymen ; and the heavy exactions with which those same countrymen are visited by the despotic Repeal Association have added to their poverty. Their great leader at once prevents their growing rich, and despoils them of what they have ; he robs them with one hand, while he keeps honest gain from them with the other.

The entire, yet simple machinery which has enabled Mr. O'Connell and his followers to wield a power over the Romanist population of Ireland, more despotic than any tyranny, ancient or modern, is all put in motion and kept working by the power of splendid mendacity ; and this system of falsehood has been so employed as to keep its victims in darkness and its inventors in affluence. The course of its working has been narrowly watched by all Governments. The Whigs watched it for their own profit ; the Tories for the sake of the country's good. The former allowed it to progress, whether it kept within the law or transgressed it. It was an equally indifferent matter to that respectable political party whether the safeguards of the country were respected or violated, so long as no violence was offered to the slippery sort of security which kept themselves in power and in place. Since the world was first distracted with faction or partizanship, no class of men professing certain principles, acting under a leader, and, in other words, constituting a party, ever incurred such shame, fell into such disgrace, or were covered with such universal contempt, as the Whigs have been during

their feuds and fraternizations, their recriminations and reconciliations, their quarrelling and coquetting with O'Connell and his faction. Never did a political party make so full and shameless a display of their own want of dignity and honesty as the Whigs did, in alternately patting and persecuting the enemies of the empire. Their overtures, when made to the foes of Protestantism and peace, were only accepted when they were worth anything in the furtherance of the treason which was meditated by the repealers of the union. Even then they were entertained with an exceeding degree of pride. If the Whigs dared but to utter a single word of remonstrance to save their own dignity, a torrent of abuse hushed them into servile quiescence again. They received with patient humility the most disgraceful epithets; nor did they care what Popish rheum was voided on their beards, as long as those beards were attached to chins that wagged with the sweets and privileges of office.

With the Whigs, Mr. O'Connell is understood to have ratified one more political treaty, to be used for the nonce, and disregarded when the hour arrives. By the help of the not unnatural union of Whiggery and Popery, it is hoped to carry that repeal, which could not be carried by any single political party or solitary faction. Through this new union, the Whigs see the way to place; by this new compact, the Repealers hope to dismember the empire. The conspirators are to help the statesmen to power; the latter are to aid the conspirators to plunder. The two parties stand now, and not for the first time, in the respective positions of thief and confederate. The confederate Whig is to let the thief into that edifice from which he is bound to keep him, and both parties then are to fire the house and secure what booty they can. The new union cemented between these whilom enemies has nothing about it more honest in intention or dignified in character than this—it is founded in selfishness, carried on in selfishness, and, we hope, will be exploded in so far the same partial light, that none may suffer by it but the traitors who framed it.

The union of Whigs and Papists is certainly as threatening a one to the peace of England as even Satan himself could have devised. The Whiggery of England has, perhaps, lost some of its old leaven of dangerous talent; but the Popery of Ireland is as unquiet, as full of ability perilous to the peace of nations, and as peculiar, in its own special degree of Popery, as ever it was. Romanism may, in every corner of the globe in which it flourishes or lingers, be known by its particular fruits. Its enmity to liberty and to education is everywhere, though in different degrees, to be traced and deplored. But there is

something about the Popery which Mr. O'Connell fosters, protects, and exalts in Ireland, essentially different from the Popery of every other part of the world. The Popery of Ireland, corrupt as it was in the beginning, has endured a further degree of corruption, which cannot be discerned in the Popish progression of any other country. The only nation in Europe in which Popery may be called quiescent, or least innocuous to the Government, is that of Austria, where she is so despotically bound, that were she but to move a finger threatening to the power enchainning her, that power could, at a blow, silence or crush her. The only nation upon the globe in which Popery is destructive to all around her, to all who profess, as to all who object, to social kindliness, to general welfare, to commercial prosperity, and to internal safety, is Ireland, where she is not only tolerated, but enjoys nearly all the freedom that is permitted to other modes of faith. In these contrasting facts we see the spirit of Popery fittingly illustrated; she cannot be in the possession of liberty but to abuse it; she cannot be safe, even to a Popish Government, but under restraint. For her own sake, and for the sake of those around her, those restraints must be continued. Under healthy bonds, she is harmless, as in Austria; in nearly total freedom, she is threatening, as in Ireland; in unrestrained liberty, she is (at least, Irish Romanism is) bloody and revengeful, as in America.

Mr. O'Connell hopes to make the old cry of "Ireland for the Irish!" become, from the religious Romanist cry that it is at present, the national united cry to rally under for the future. If it should ever become the national, as it is now the merely party and factious *slogan*, it will then be early enough to treat of it; at present it means this, that every post, place, office, and privilege in Ireland shall be conferred on Irishmen only. Were this principle admitted, its absurdity must necessarily be applied to England also; and a Dublin man could never be permitted to become even an under-secretary in Downing-street. What would be the consequence? Even this: the Irish Romanists would at once declare that they derived no advantages whatever from the British constitution, if they were to be excluded from holding official appointments under it; and their cry would be so far extended in meaning as to imply, "Let us have Ireland to ourselves, and let us share England between us!" It is the lion's half upon which Popery has ever growled its claim; the toleration of the party making it has ever been full freedom for themselves, and a mitigated liberty for all the world besides. It is to obtain this so-called toleration that O'Connell is aiming at the destruction of the Established Church in Ireland; it is an

establishment that he would not attempt to injure, but that he hopes, through the Whigs, to destroy Protestantism with it. His line of action, and his apology for it, is like that of the old Irish earl, who, on being summoned to England for having burnt down the cathedral at Kildare, excused himself before the Privy Council by saying, that he should never have thought of setting fire to that building, only that he fancied the archbishop was in it !

Now, setting the consideration of England aside, let our readers compare for themselves the qualifications of natives of Scotland with those of Ireland for official posts and commercial pursuits. The latter have many good qualities both of heart and head, but few that enable them to serve their country, without some drawback to their usefulness. In our colonies almost all political posts of difficulty, and, with that, worth the holding, and nearly all good trading positions, are occupied by Scotchmen. Let it be remembered that there is no political disqualification of Irishmen, but a self-disqualification on the part of the latter, inasmuch as they neither possess, nor care to possess, the self-denying, self-instructing, and persevering habits which make the Scotchman such a valuable representative abroad of the body politic at home. With Belfast, a "non-Catholic" city, no other city in Ireland can be compared for its prosperity. The trade of Dublin has, indeed, wonderfully increased since the union, but compared with Belfast, and considering its peculiar advantages, it is scarcely worth mentioning. Look, on the other hand, at Glasgow. Industry has made it a city of palaces. The fluctuations of trade do indeed give paupers to its wynds, as well as princes to its squares ; still it is the quiet, unpolitical, pursuit of trade that has conferred the wealth of royalty on its merchants, and made her representatives prosperous and respected, in Mexico, Rio Janeiro, Valparaiso, Chili, Montreal, and Quebec. These men, none of them Romanists, occupy positions in Popish countries open to competition, and to which their Irish fellow-subjects can never attain. We need not trouble ourselves nor our readers to point out the reasons of this. The causes are not in the Irish character, but in Popery itself. The colonies of Roman Catholic States have been curses to their mother country. They have, in turn, ruined Spain, injured France, and hurt themselves. The colonies of Protestant countries have, with some exceptions it is true, been generally of advantage both to the parent State and the protected settlement. That we have lost the most valuable is no argument to the contrary. There is a time when every colony has a right to its independence. When Protestant

colonies have been lost, it is that they have been fit for freedom. Those which have fallen away from Spain, for instance, do not yet even comprehend the meaning or the uses of it. Mexico and South America are reeking with gore. And the United States have been seduced from the path which might have conducted them to glory and universal respect, only by the demoralising effects of unrestrained Popery in alliance with licentious infidelity.

Mr. O'Connell declares that Irishmen are not only in adversity, but that they are driven into it by English policy. In a moment we can prove the contrary to be the fact. We would simply ask, if Irishmen are purely the victims of English injustice, whence arises the circumstance, that when they *do* escape from British domination, they so completely fail in securing better treatment elsewhere? Why are they successively driven out of the field of labour in Belgium, France, and Austria? Is there not Popery enough for them in either of those countries? Or is it that Popery is so dissimilar to the mixed politico-religious faith they profess at home, that in the Church abroad they fail to recognize that of their fathers? We really suspect the latter to be the case, to an extent that is little imagined. The Romanist Church in Ireland has sunk into a political and superstitious Church: what truths she may hold are nothing compared to the errors she teaches, and the political advantages she aims at through the crafty employment of them. But there is a Popery abroad which, superstitious and untrue as it may be, does not exist merely on disloyalty, political agitation, and the robbing of the poor. Look at Lower Canada; infidels, under a Popish mask, have worked evil enough there, it is true; but the old French Canadian Church, consisting as it does of the old Bourbon Absolutist school, is at least a loyal community, and expresses no sympathy with measures of disunion, even where

* About ten years since, a very large number of Mr. O'Connell's countrymen emigrated to Pennsylvania—a portion of a country which had already repealed its union with the mother state. Surely this was a field where happiness was to be found. Far enough off, one would think, to be out of the reach of English injustice. Abundant labours on railroads and canals, high wages, and food of all sorts within reach, and at nominal prices. Can Mr. O'Connell inform the public how it happened that large public meetings simultaneously assembled in Philadelphia and elsewhere, and passed resolutions, that if the directors of the railroad companies, and other employers, did not immediately discharge the whole of the Irish labourers in their pay, that they, the American requisitionists, would arm themselves, and expel the whole Irish body of labourers beyond the limits of Pennsylvania? Why was this? Not because there was not room in the State for all, and even for more, to live and to thrive, but because the Irish were a political Romanist party, threatening the peace of all opposed to them; a party that, with or without provocation, took the law into its own hands, and practically erased the sixth commandment from the decalogue.

the Crown is Protestant. It knows how to distinguish between infidels even of the French school, who creep into its communion for purposes of political agitation, and those who, as Christians, "submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." It knows that a Church (like that of Rome in Ireland) may so far become a political Church, as to cease to be a Christian one; and it plainly enough expresses that knowledge, by the terms on which it consents *with* such a Church to hold intercommunion.

The priests of the Romish communion in Lower Canada have more than once been mainly instrumental in preserving the adhesion of that colony to the British Crown; nor do we find them at any time in the ranks of Mr. O'Connell's sympathizers. The conspiring, disaffected, and political policy of Rome has not reached this portion of her flock in Lower Canada. The latter country was urged into rebellion by infidel incendiaries and Papist conspirators, sent on a mission of evil from Europe. Though, in one sense, it may be used as an argument against some portion of what we have already advanced, yet we should be ashamed not to admit the loyalty which exists in the old French Church of Lower Canada.

Two great measures necessary for the tranquillity and prosperity of Ireland, and consequently for the overthrow of Mr. O'Connell's vocation, are the inculcating truths for the eternal, and instruction for the temporal, welfare of the entire community of Ireland. The temporizing national system of education in that country, which, if it be not content with leaving every one in the mentally dark position in which circumstances have placed him, goes even further, and aids Popery to keep him there, must be abolished. This system has been eloquently denounced by Dr. Mant, the Bishop of Down and Connor—a prelate who is not only conscious of a saving truth to be preached, but who will not quietly allow of that truth being gagged. But aids to the spreading of this truth will be absolutely nothing, if there be not also facilities afforded for their being comprehended. Years ago, quaint old Peter Heylin remarked, that the darkened condition in which Ireland remained, even subsequent to the Reformation, was in nowise surprising:—

"There being no care taken to instruct the Irish in the Protestant religion, either by translating the Bible or the English Liturgy into their own language, as was done in Wales; but they are forced to come to church to the English service, which the people understand no more than they do the mass.....By means whereof the Irish are not only kept in continual ignorance as to the doctrine and devotions of the Church of England, and other Protestant Churches, but those

of Rome are furnished with an excellent argument for having the service of the Church in a language which the common hearers do not understand. And therefore I do heartily commend it to the care of the State (*when these distempers are composed*) to provide that they may have the Bible, and all other public means of Christian instruction and devotion, in their natural tongue."

Something has been effected, it is true, to make old Peter Heylin's request no longer applicable. Bishop Bedell translated the Scriptures into Irish, and irregularly ordained one clergyman to preach in the Irish tongue; but this and some later isolated attempts of individuals have comprised all that has been done to impart the truths of Christianity in such a way that they shall be intelligible to the understandings of those to whom they are revealed. Partial as these attempts have been, their success is warrant for that of a more extended endeavour. We have learned and pious missionaries—nay, and dignified prelates too—of our holy mother Church, who have studied even unwritten languages, in order to make themselves understood by savage hearers, who have listened and learned to their edification. The Indians of either hemisphere, the tribes of the continents, and the dwellers in the islands of the Pacific, have all heard the word of life uttered in their own language, and experienced its efficacy and its blessing in their own persons. The Gael has responded to it on his hill sides, and the descendant of the old native Britons on his mountains and in his valleys. It is in Ireland alone, where the necessity is greatest, that the supply has been least. How many, or rather how few, are able to interpret the great message to nations, to the unheeding ears of a secluded Irish population. The Church of England never fully attempted, at first to be, or since to become, an *Irish* Church; and the sheep have not followed the voice of a shepherd which they knew not. Is it well that we have hitherto neglected the power of addressing an Irish audience as cultivated and used by Dissenting missionaries? Shall not the talent, influence, and resources of the Church in Ireland be directed, on a suitable scale, to the attainment of its legitimate object, by legitimate means and appliances? We translate the word of God into all languages, and send out men qualified to teach and preach the truth of God, so far as is in our power, to all the tribes that dwell upon the earth. While for centuries wholly, and even now *almost* wholly, we exclude the native Irish from joining in the Pentecostal song of praise, saying, "We do hear them speak in our tongue the wonderful works of God."

With regard to the temporal welfare of Ireland, it is only necessary to say that she possesses within herself, or has the

power of obtaining, more wealth than is possessed or could be acquired by any other country of equal territorial surface. There is no soil or subsoil in the world so rich, superficially and minerally, with the exception, perhaps, of that of Siberia. Ireland does not even want capital, whether foreign or native, to ensure her commercial prosperity; she wants but the one simple, yet important, quality of *security*. Want of that has driven millions to Mexico, for ever lost in its mines, that might have made numberless Irish families happy. That she does not want internal resources, look but for a moment at her own self-taxation, merely for the Romanist clergy. It is calculated that they receive—

For annual confessions	£300,000
Ditto christenings.....	33,333
Unctions and burials.....	60,000
Marriages.....	300,000
Purgatory, prayers for	100,000
Collections at chapels	541,623
Curates' collections	22,500
Maynooth College, Government grant...	9,000

£1,366,456

The voluntary taxation of Ireland, in the above and similar modes, probably exceeds the amount of taxation which she would pay, if liable (as Ireland ought to be) to income, window, and other taxes, county and other rates. In fact, the priests' fees, as well as the O'Connell rent, are partly paid by England and Scotland. The army expenditure in Ireland is a boon to that country, and a loss to Great Britain. Were Scotland but blessed with a military occupation of but half the extent of that which Ireland enjoys, and is too glad to enjoy, there is no doubt that she would be an infinite gainer. And were some Scottish O'Connell to agitate his country for obtaining an equality of, or rather an exemption from, taxation, with Ireland, there would be some ground of fairness to go upon, when it is remembered how much less fertile is the soil of Scotland than that of Ireland, and how generally inferior the former is with respect to mineral wealth.

It is certainly neither English misgovernment nor injustice that has made it necessary for a military force to protect the labour of English workmen sent to Ireland to instruct the natives in the working of their own mines. What was it but Popish violence, and consequent insecurity, that have driven Liverpool merchants from establishing branch businesses in Ireland? We

are ourselves cognizant of the fact of a junior member of a firm visiting the latter country for the purpose of investing 30,000*l.* in a branch house of trade, and abandoning the enterprize in whole—some terror at the murder, in broad day, and in his own domain, of Lord Norbury.

Another illustration of the obstruction that Popery is, in this unhappy country, even to temporal improvement, may be cited in the case, mentioned to us, of a Glasgow engineer, who was sent, with other Glasgow “bodies” and Greenock “folk,” to fix an extensive draining apparatus in a remote Romish province. This man, on his return to Scotland, expressed his gratitude that he had escaped with life, vowing that he would never again conclude a contract for any work requiring his presence in Ireland. The reason he assigned (and it is not without its instruction for Lord John Manners) was the following:—that on every saint’s-day the priest and his followers threatened violence, even to murder, if the labourers did not wholly abstain from work. Compliance, of course, was unavoidable; the contractor endured a loss both in time and money, and gained nothing but bodily fear, which led to a resolution that, in principle, was as injurious to the true interests of Ireland, as it was, in fact, to his own.

Look again at the moral which the morning papers of one day, in the middle of September, conveyed to Ireland, in the account of the immense sale of American provisions in London. That sale might, but for the political Popery of Mr. O’Connell, have been entirely of Irish stock; but his baleful agitation has brought the wary American dealer into direct competition with the Irish merchant in the London market, and one of the tested results is as follows:—American hams brought to the hammer in London, and offered in lots of from three thousand to four thousand each, have realized from 37*s.* to 42*s.* per cwt. These hams are equal in quality to Irish hams, which have generally commanded from 60*s.* to 70*s.* per cwt. Now upon the American goods a duty had been paid, previous to sale, of 14*s.* for every cwt.; this duty reduced the actual realizing price to the seller of 23*s.* and 28*s.* per cwt.: and yet it is susceptible of proof, that at that price ample profit is secured to the American breeders, curers, packers, and consigners, as well as to all other parties concerned, whether on the other or on this side of the Atlantic. The Irish provision trade, then, is threatened with speedy and total destruction. Ohio and Tennessee alone will, in a few years, with the aid of English capital and skill, be able to supply the entire demand of Great Britain. Our new tariffs have been the sorcery that has magically developed the immense productive resources of those districts, in pork and

"bread stuffs." Although situated within the United States as centrally as Northamptonshire is located in England, canals and railroads confer practically on both an available sea-board at a comparatively nominal cost. In these States, in the year 1842, food was a complete drug—so much so, that the abdominal part of pigs was, on a principle of economy, cut up, mixed with coal, and used as fuel in the Mississippi steamers !

We ask, regarding the relation in which England and Ireland stand to each other, is it not almost an injustice that *we* should pay a duty of 14s. per cwt. on American food brought into our ports, *solely* for the benefit and protection of the Irish grower ? The benefit and protection the latter gains by it is of a very Irish nature indeed. The import is, in fact, a direct injury inflicted on English manufacturers, for the advantage of the Irish raiser, who has little gratitude for, and not much benefit from, it. What amount of English manufactured goods do the Irish take in exchange for the provisions we purchase from them at an exorbitant rate ? What amount of sterling money passes from Liverpool to Belfast annually for provisions ? Is it not nearer two than one million sterling ? If American food be admitted on the same terms that England takes Irish food, will not the demand for British manufactured goods in America become treble what it is ? Ireland enjoys a remission of taxation and protecting duties, but these benefits have been converted into weapons of offence and warfare ; and thus have the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel been requited for their ill-timed benevolence in passing the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. Mr. O'Connell, in the mean time, looks to an alliance with the Whigs ; and doubtless may hope that, among other things, that alliance may help the Irish provision merchant into the market again ; but let him remember that the Whigs stand committed to free trade principles, and, consequently, their accession must be followed by the abolition of all protecting duties, and of course, among others, of that in favour of Irish hams.

But our fast-failing space reminds us that we must here conclude. Ere our next number appears, the story of Ireland may probably present an entirely new chapter, to the amazement of the world. There are so many projects in contemplation, that we have not room to narrate them ; but whichever may be adopted—a federal union, a separation, a connection like that of Norway and Sweden, or Dr. Maunsell's *tertian* Parliament—Ireland will assuredly never know freedom or prosperity as long as she lies under the heavy and intolerable yoke of the most bitter and grievous of tyrannies, viz., political Popery.

Ecclesiastical Report.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON AND HIS DETRACTORS.

THERE are many persons, it seems, who are constantly labouring to detract from the fair fame of the Bishop of London—to misrepresent his conduct, and excite against him the odium of the public. That such attempts can be successful we have no apprehension whatever, but they show the feelings of certain parties. Were the Bishop of London an inactive and careless man, the parties who are so constantly cavilling at his lordship's proceedings would be silent. His talents, and the exercise of those talents in his diocese, in the House of Lords, and in the execution of the important duties which devolve upon him, excite the envy and the jealousy of some, who have neither his talents, nor his disposition to use the talents which they have for the good of the people and the glory of God.

We have been led to notice the subject by a long and laboured article in the *Westminster Review*, in which the whole of the bishop's episcopal life is surveyed. This article, from such a quarter, we consider as the greatest compliment which could have been paid, coming as it does from an enemy, to the Bishop of London. Even the abuse of the *Westminster Review*—we mean the abuse of a bishop—is no mean praise. In other matters the reviewers may probably act with impartiality; but, when a bishop or the Church is concerned, impartiality is generally superseded by abuse. In our opinion, therefore, the fact that these reviewers could find no more to allege against the Bishop of London is his high commendation.

The whole article is made up of insinuations—of insinuations that his lordship troubles himself with business unbecoming in his station—of insinuations that, after all, his talents are mean and petty, and that his mind is of the most ordinary stamp. Yet their own article, written as it is with a view to disparage the bishop, proves most incontestably that their insinuations are unfounded.

As usual, the charge of bigotry is alleged; yet common candour ought to have led the reviewers to acknowledge, that no prelate has acted with more liberality. Because he does not act in concert with the Whigs, he must, forsooth, be illiberal. The Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill is brought forward in proof of their charge, as if true liberality did not consist in opposing a creed which does not permit its professors to be liberal.

It is not our intention to follow the reviewers through all their allegations; our object is merely to direct attention to the article, because we feel assured that all right-minded persons will admit, that a more unjust attack was never made.

However, it is strange that portions of the article should have been quoted in the *Times*. The circumstance shows the rancour and hostility of that journal—a journal which on all occasions is ready to assail the Bishop of London. But there is a curious fact connected with the subject, which we proceed to notice. It is notorious, that the hostility of the *Times* to the Bishop of London arises from his lordship's conduct on the *Poor Law Bill*. Let this fact be borne in mind, in order that the virulence of the *Times* may be duly appreciated. In the *Westminster Review* the bishop's conduct on the Poor Law is almost the only point on which any praise is awarded; for this the reviewers are loud in their approbation. Differing, therefore, as the *Times* and the *Westminster Review* do on this subject, yet the former can forego its hostility to the latter for a time, in order to inflict a blow on the Bishop of London. We consider such conduct as a proof, that the opposition of the *Times* is founded on that one question: and on account of that they can unite with parties, with whom they have nothing in common, for the purpose of attacking a prelate whose talents and position make it necessary for him to act a conspicuous part in the country, and therefore sometimes to incur the displeasure of that journal.

It must be manifest to our readers, that the *Times* is always ready to assail the Bishop of London. Even should his name be placed on a committee of the Lords, the circumstance is made the subject of sarcastic remarks in the *Times*. They would insinuate, and so would the *Westminster Reviewers*, that his lordship acts overbearingly towards his clergy; yet there is not a man in the diocese of London, with the exception of such as have become obnoxious to censure, and who regard all authority as tyranny, who does not feel that in his diocesan he has a kind and faithful friend. Nor did we ever meet with a clergyman in other dioceses, with the exception of such persons as those to whom we have alluded, who would experience any reluctance to reside under his lordship's jurisdiction.

His lordship's last charge is made the subject of animadversion by the reviewers, who charge him with trying to balance matters between *Puseyism* and *Evangelicalism*. The bishop is represented as descending to matters of no importance—mere trifles—articles of dress—caps, surplices, and gowns. Un-

doubtedly such matters are discussed ; but there was an absolute necessity for the discussion. Had the minds of the clergy been undisturbed by these questions, they would not have been stirred up by the Bishop of London. But in the present circumstances of the Church it was quite impossible for the Bishop of London to meet his clergy, after a period of three years, without entering upon the questions respecting which there had been so much agitation and so many opinions expressed. He therefore entered upon the questions, and entered upon them fully. Some men might, for the sake of ease, have avoided them altogether ; but the Bishop of London is not a man to shrink from a duty because its performance may involve a difficulty. He met the questions boldly, and met them so as to please neither extreme in the Church—a circumstance which, to our minds, is conclusive that he pursued a moderate and judicious course. He has been assailed by both extremes ; and we are convinced that he has acted with the greatest prudence and discretion.

The questions discussed in the charge no doubt appear trivial to the *Westminster Reviewers*, who care for none of these things ; but the charge was not intended for those gentlemen, nor for persons of their school : it was intended for the clergy of the diocese of London, by the majority of whom it was duly appreciated.

There were, indeed, men who were annoyed at the sight of a surplice in the pulpit, and at the use of the prayer for the Church militant, as though the former were Popish in the pulpit, though lawful and decent in the desk, and the latter were not positively enjoined by the Church ; but with a few exceptions, and those of persons whose opinions are not of much value, the bishop's recommendations commended themselves to the judgment of discreet and sober-minded men, as the most likely means of setting matters right which had been so fiercely disputed. We feel, indeed, that a prelate who could earn the abuse of the *Times*, who would condemn all whose opinions on the Poor Law are different from its own ; of the Radicals, with the *Westminster Reviewers* at their head ; and of that school, nominally within the Church, whose advocates can hold the pre-ferments of the Church while they renounce in practice the discipline to which they have pledged themselves—must approximate so nearly to the truth, that we should not hesitate, were there no other evidence on the subject, in coming to the conclusion, that such an individual must necessarily hold sound views on all disputed, as well as on all other questions. And this is just the position of the Bishop of London at the present moment. The *Times*,

the *Westminster Reviewers*, and a journal considered as the representative of a party whose views are more accordant with *Independency* than with *Episcopacy*, concur in reviling a man who has done as much for the Church as any individual living during the last twenty years. This testimony was borne to the Bishop of London by Sir Robert Peel, in the House of Commons, on introducing his bill for Church Extension. Moderate men will duly appreciate the Bishop of London, whatever may be the case with extreme parties in the Church, whose opinions are entitled to little credit, from the very circumstance that they are extreme.

The *Westminster Reviewers* have unwittingly paid the Bishop of London a compliment, in comparing him with Sir Robert Peel. They intended the comparison as a sarcasm, but we feel that it is true. No greater praise could be awarded to a bishop, than to make him in the Church what Sir Robert Peel is in the State. Much as the Premier is traduced by the Whigs on the one hand, and by the Ultra-Conservatives on the other, of whom the *Westminster Reviewers* and the *Times* may be considered as the representatives, yet we would ask how the affairs of the nation could be carried on without Sir Robert Peel, or, at all events, a man acting on his principles. We do not profess to approve of every measure which the right honourable baronet has introduced, but we confess our adherence to his main principles. And let us ask the reviewers, whether their party could stand, as a Ministry, against the votes of a single week of any House of Commons which could now be assembled? We may ask the *Times* also, whether any men holding the extreme views of that paper on all questions, could maintain their ground as a Ministry? The answer is obvious. What, then, is the common-sense conclusion to which all unprejudiced and unbiassed persons must necessarily come, on a calm and impartial review of our present circumstances? Is it not this—that Sir Robert Peel, of all men living, is best fitted to guide the helm of the vessel of the State, in the present circumstances of the country? Such is our opinion, and we feel that the Bishop of London, in the Church, is prepared to pursue a similar course to that which is pursued by Sir Robert Peel in the State—viz., the only course which can secure the peace and advance the interests of our ecclesiastical institutions. We believe that the Bishop of London is prepared for all salutary and necessary reforms; while, at the same time, he is actuated by a true spirit of Conservatism, in not interfering with settled institutions, or with customs and practices which time has rendered sacred, and which are dear to the people. We think, therefore, that the comparison of the reviewers is really a just one—that they have paid a compli-

ment to, when they intended to cast a reproach upon, the Bishop of London.

THE BISHOPS OF GLOUCESTER AND EXETER.

A most invidious contrast was recently instituted in the *Times* between these two prelates, on account of the charge of the one, and the conduct of the other, in a matter which we wish to notice. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has recently delivered a charge to his clergy, at which the wrath of the *Times* has been excited. His lordship alluded briefly to the *Tracts for the Times*, expressing much respect for the authors, though he saw no reason to depart from his former opinion respecting their principles. There was so much sound advice in this part of his lordship's charge, that we are astonished at the indignation expressed by the *Times*. The bishop considered that much abuse had been heaped upon the authors of the *Tracts*—that they had done service to the Church, though some of their views, in his opinion, tended towards Rome; and he expressed his regret that the things which they recommended were not considered on their own merits, without reference to the quarter from which the recommendation emanated. His lordship also considered, that the most effectual mode of silencing all objectors would be to follow the directions of the Church implicitly, without reference to parties or party questions. But because his lordship expressed himself decidedly against some of the views of the *Tracts*, he has drawn upon himself the anger of the *Times*.

This journal, in order to punish the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol for the honest expression of his sentiments, chose to exhibit what they called a contrast between his lordship and the Bishop of Exeter. It happened just before, that the latter prelate had given permission to Dr. Pusey to preach in his diocese. This circumstance is extolled by the *Times* as an act of great magnanimity, while they allege that the Bishop of Gloucester is actually traducing the party of which Dr. Pusey is the reputed leader.

Now we are prepared to show, that there is no difference of opinion between these two prelates respecting the *Tracts*, nor any difference in their practice with respect to Dr. Pusey.

With regard to the *Tracts*, the Bishop of Exeter has expressed himself in the same manner as the Bishop of Gloucester. In one of his charges, his lordship pointedly and strongly condemned a series of opinions which had been advocated in the *Tracts*. So severe was his censure, that it was felt by the *British Critic*, more than all the censures of all the other bishops

who had alluded to the subject. The language of the Bishop of Gloucester was far softer than that of the Bishop of Exeter. In short, the opinions of these two prelates, both respecting the views and the authors of the *Tracts*, are precisely the same. Both admit that the men have done a service to the Church, but both feel that the *Tracts* contain serious errors, against which they feel it their duty to protest.

Now with respect to Dr. Pusey. The conduct of both prelates is the same respecting this gentleman. What are the facts of the case? Dr. Pusey has been censured by the Oxford Board, and suspended from preaching in the University pulpit. We ask, what have the bishops to do with that censure? And is there a bishop on the bench who, should a clergyman ask Dr. Pusey to preach, would feel it to be his duty to interfere? Assuredly not. The censure of the University is not an episcopal act—it extends not beyond the precincts of the University; and no bishop could so far regard it, as to interpose his authority to prevent Dr. Pusey from preaching in his diocese. Such a thing would never enter the head of a bishop, since all our prelates are aware that the censure refers only to the University.

It seems that the vicar or rector of Ilfracombe requested Dr. Pusey to preach in his church; and the bishop being there at the time, holding a confirmation, the subject was mentioned to his lordship, who did not, and who could not, reasonably refuse his permission. This permission was construed by two extreme parties—by the advocates of the *Tracts*, and by the nonconforming and insincere Churchmen of whom we have previously spoken—into an approval of Dr. Pusey's peculiar views, and a condemnation of the Oxford board for their censure of that gentleman's sermon. Nothing of the kind was intended by the Bishop of Exeter, who merely assented to the proposal of the rector of Ilfracombe—a proposal to which any other bishop must have yielded. For this he is lauded by one party, and condemned by another; whereas the act was an ordinary act, meriting neither praise nor blame.

And now let us see how this conduct differs from that of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Has Dr. Pusey preached in the diocese of Bristol since his suspension in Oxford? We believe he has. At all events, no obstacle will be thrown in the way should the rector of Clifton, where he sometimes resides, ask him to preach. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol would not feel himself called upon to interfere. He knows that he is in no way concerned with the Oxford sentence; and while he would not prevent another clergyman from preaching an occasional sermon, he would not interpose to prevent Dr. Pusey. In

short, Dr. Pusey, if solicited by clergymen, could go into any diocese and preach, without any prohibition on the part of the bishop, because the bishop would feel that he had nothing to do with the Oxford censure.

Thus the two bishops are agreed: both have pursued, and will pursue, a similar line of conduct; and the contrast of the *Times* had no existence except in the imagination of the writer. The *Times* intended their remarks as a compliment to the Bishop of Exeter, at the expense of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol; but the former will fully comprehend the reasons by which the writer was actuated in thus placing two prelates in invidious contrast. We are sure that Dr. Pusey himself would be the last person to approve of such conduct on the part of the *Times*. That gentleman has never spoken disrespectfully of any of our bishops—not even of those who have condemned some of his own writings: no one would be more ready to deprecate such comparisons. Whatever may be the errors in some of his writings, he is a man of peace and of truth: he would not lend himself to a party to traduce an excellent and prudent prelate, who, in the discharge of his duties, might feel himself called upon to condemn certain opinions, the spread of which, in his judgment, must be mischievous.

THE WELSH SEES.

We are exceedingly distressed at the issue of the proceedings in the House of Lords respecting the two Welsh dioceses. It appears that the Act could not be rescinded without the consent of the Crown; and her Majesty's Ministers did not feel themselves at liberty to recommend the Crown to adopt such a measure. We are sorry that such should be the result, for we are most anxious that the Act for uniting the two sees should not be permitted to take effect. Probably in another session some one may move an address to her Majesty on the subject. Should it be carried, it is not likely that the Royal permission will be refused. May this result be realized in the next session!

It is evident that funds may be provided for the creation of a new see at Manchester, without robbing Wales of a bishop. We apprehend, however, that there are other difficulties, which the Government and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners cannot overcome. In the present state of feeling, they are not willing to increase the number of bishops in the House of Lords; nor can they see their way clear to an appointment of prelates without seats in that house. We think, however, that the difficulties might be obviated, by preserving the number of spiritual peers as at present, and allowing the bishops, who might be

appointed to newly-created sees, to take their place in the house, according to seniority, as vacancies occurred on the bench. It would be easy to translate from the newly-created sees, though translations were not permitted in other cases; so that the bishops of the ancient sees might always hold their seats in the House of Lords. Then it would be understood, that the new sees should be held by prelates who, as vacancies occurred in the old ones, should be translated in order that they might fill up the number of the spiritual peers. Assuredly no inconvenience could arise from such an arrangement: the Episcopacy of the Church would not be lowered in the estimation of the people; while the Church and the country would be greatly benefitted. We do, therefore, hope that some plan will be devised, not to unite sees, but to divide them. The smallest see is as much as one man can possibly attend to; while the larger are sufficient, each one, for two bishops. Active as is the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, yet it is impossible for his lordship to superintend both dioceses as he could superintend one. Every town and every village should occasionally be visited by a bishop; but this is utterly impossible in many of our large dioceses. In Wales, though the population may be scanty compared with some parts of England, yet the extent of country is great, and a bishop's time must be fully occupied in discharging his various duties, even in the smallest of the Welsh dioceses.

Some of the speeches on the subject in the House of Lords, in the recent session, made an impression which will not soon be forgotten. Especially was this the case with those of the Bishop of Bangor and the Bishop of Salisbury.

We are quite ready to admit that there is some difficulty in departing from the plan recommended by the Ecclesiastical Commission. That Commission was formed at a time when the Church appeared to be in considerable danger. The reports were received and sanctioned by the Whig Administration, though the Commission was formed by Sir Robert Peel's; and Whigs as well as Conservatives must feel themselves bound by its decisions. To revoke its decisions in the case of the Welsh sees might afford a dangerous precedent, should a Whig Administration ever again hold the reins of Government. Such a feeling as this may probably influence some of those who opposed the rescinding of the Act in question. Still we do not think that any advantage could be taken of so simple a proceeding as the preservation of the two sees distinct, at the earnest solicitations of the people. The persons, indeed, who would take advantage of such a proceeding, would not be likely to be deterred from a course of opposition to the Church, even

were they unable to plead any departure from the recommendation of the Commission. We still hope, therefore, that means may be adopted to prevent the union of the two dioceses.

THE CAMBRIDGE CAMDEN SOCIETY.

Mr. Faulkner is, as it appears to us, pursuing a most ill-judged course, in troubling himself about a matter of such perfect indifference as the material of which his communion-table is formed. He ought to be thankful for what the Society has done for his church, rather than fly in the faces of men who have rescued the edifice from the decay into which it must have fallen had it been left to Mr. Faulkner's own exertions. There is one circumstance which gives the whole affair a most ludicrous appearance, namely, that Mr. Faulkner, in another church of which he is incumbent—for it seems the reverend gentleman is a pluralist—has a table of the very same material as that to which he objects in Cambridge. Thus he views a thing to be sinful in Cambridge which is lawful and right in another parish. After viewing the stone table with abhorrence in one place, the reverend gentleman can go to his other parish and there remain blind to the same abomination. All this certainly indicates that Mr. Faulkner is the mere tool of a party; were it not so, his conscience would be as tender in one place as in another. Our advice, therefore, to the reverend gentleman is, to sit still; for we can assure him that, with the exception of a few persons of extreme opinions, who would be more consistent if they were to quit the Church of England altogether, no one will sympathize with him in this affliction of his own creation; nay, the public will look upon the fact of his being a pluralist as a far more heinous offence than the erection of a stone communion-table. We must further advise the public not to contribute their money for the expenses of such a proceeding. Every Christian man should consider himself only as the steward of those bounties which the providence of God vouchsafes—a steward who must give an account of the manner in which those bounties are distributed. He is, therefore, under an obligation to distribute them in the best way; and sure we are that there are many better ways than that of contributing towards a fund for the expenses of a man who ventured to go to law with a Society respecting the material of a communion-table.

CASE OF THE REV. J. SHORE.

The recent proceedings, instituted under the Church Discipline Act, against the Rev. Mr. Shore, a clergyman in the diocese of Exeter, are of very great importance, and will probably form a

precedent for similar proceedings in other dioceses. Mr. Shore, it appears, is one of those clergymen who make very little of acting in defiance of episcopal authority, whenever it runs counter to their own wishes. He was anxious to obtain a license to a chapel in a particular parish, which was declined by the incumbent. After this the bishop had no power to act. Every incumbent, as the spiritual director of a parish, has a right to exercise his own discretion respecting the clergymen who may wish to occupy chapels within his jurisdiction. This right was exercised in the case in question; and because he could not procure a license in a clergyman's parish, Mr. Shore chose to proceed without one, pleading the Toleration Act, and claiming the privileges of a Dissenter. Of course such a man's principles cannot be those of the Anglican Church. At the same time, he is a clergyman in holy orders, and the question is, whether he can so far take advantage of the Toleration Act as to screen himself from the operation of the canons.

A commission was issued by the Bishop of Exeter, under the Church Discipline Bill, to enquire whether further proceedings were necessary. The object contemplated seems to be the removal of Mr. Shore from the Church by due course of law; and we cannot but think it desirable that such men should be precluded from assuming the ministerial functions in other dioceses. Mr. Shore might possibly be admitted to a cure in another diocese; but after acting in defiance of one bishop, he ought not to be permitted to exercise his office elsewhere. This may be prevented by a process in the Court of Arches, which will issue in the deprivation of his clerical character, so that he would never be able to act as a clergyman of the Church of England. We are of opinion, too, that a similar process should be adopted towards all those clergymen who are acting in defiance of episcopal authority, under the provisions of the Toleration Act. Let them enjoy the protection of the Act, but let them first be deprived of their clerical character. Such men are more consistent as Dissenters than as Churchmen.

Mr. Shore says he has no wish to remain in the Church. This is undoubtedly the truth. Why then did he apply for a license from the Bishop of Exeter? If he had no wish to remain in the Church, why act so inconsistent a part as to seek to be licensed? His principles are not changed since the application—he remains the same man still. The conclusion, therefore, to which all reflecting persons must come is this—that Mr. Shore did not apply for a license on any principle, but merely to answer some private purpose. Had he been a true Churchman at that time, he could not have quitted the Church on being

thwarted in a particular object. What, then, can be thought of a man who could apply for a license, when at the same time he did not hold the principles which he was about to subscribe ?

THE CHURCH PATRONAGE SOCIETY.

Our readers are probably not aware of a society under the above designation ; neither were we ourselves aware of it until very recently. The object is to procure money from charitably-disposed persons for the purpose of purchasing livings, which are to be placed in the hands of trustees, with a view to the appointment of men of particular views and principles. All this is done under the pretence of promoting the preaching of the Gospel. The Jesuits' maxim is, that the end sanctifies the means ; and it appears to us that this society has adopted it in its fullest extent. Every well-disposed man must surely admit that the sale of Church patronage is an evil ; yet, in order to advance the interest of a party, the supporters of this society can take advantage of the law, and do an act which sound Churchmen cannot contemplate with satisfaction. Suppose Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman, with their friends, were to form a similar society, what an outcry would be raised against the proceeding. We should have long dissertations on the danger of the Church, and tiresome exhortations to do something to check the evil. Now we feel assured that Dr. Pusey and his friends could establish a society, and raise much more money than the society now in existence. But whatever may be the errors of that party, they will not add to them, by adopting a course which, as it seems to us, no one, on reflection, can justify. Dr. Pusey and his friends are willing to leave Church livings to the ordinary operation of the law—an example which the Patronage Society would do well to copy. Such a course would be far more consistent than the one which they are now pursuing. It is our decided opinion, that such proceedings, on the part of men professing godliness, are erroneous : it is a sort of distrust of Divine Providence. That men, who are so ready to complain of all who do not see with their eyes and walk in their steps, should be guilty of such an act, surprises us greatly. Applications are made to wealthy individuals for money, under the plea of promoting the spread of the Gospel in those parishes which can be purchased ; but we warn and caution our readers against such proceedings. On no account let money be given for such a purpose. The usual arguments will have no weight with right-minded persons ; they will not be influenced to do what at best must be considered as questionable, by the specious pretence, that by supporting such a society they will advance

the Gospel of Christ. Right-judging men will be content to leave all such matters in the disposal of Divine Providence. Really, if such proceedings become common, it will be necessary for the Church to interfere to prevent them. They must issue in the injury of the Church; and whatever may be argued about promoting the Gospel, all reflecting persons will perceive that the object is to promote the cause of a party. It is admitted generally, that the sale of livings is an evil, though permitted by the law of the land. Is it then consistent, in the persons who constitute the Patronage Society, to take advantage of a state of things, of which, if they love the Church, they must disapprove, under the plea of promoting the Gospel? Would it not be more consistent to leave all such matters to the ordinary operation of the law, rather than to tempt the providence of God, by dictating the way in which the Gospel is to be made known? All combinations of this kind are very suspicious; we cannot conceive how consistent men can justify them; and we trust that few persons will be found to contribute their money for such an object. There are always men who, for the sake of obtaining a paltry living, will cringe and bow to those clergymen in whom such trusts are vested; and there are always persons in holy orders to be found who, for the sake of the patronage, and the influence which they obtain over a few individuals, whose merits would never procure them preferment in the straightforward course, are anxious to undertake the charge, though they invariably plead for their conduct a regard for God's glory, and a desire to advance the interests of their fellow-men. For our part, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that all such combinations originate in selfish and party feelings.

THE HARVEST.

It would be wrong in us not to remind our readers of the bounties of Providence, in one of the most abundant harvests within the memory of man, and not to direct them to offer their tribute of gratitude to HIM from whom all our blessings flow. The present season has been a very remarkable one. Undoubtedly, the long-continued dry weather was injurious to the crops of grass, so that the farmer may experience some difficulty, from want of hay, in the ensuing winter; but then the abundance of the harvest is more than a counterbalance for this deficiency; and altogether the country was never, with respect to the fruits of the earth, in a more prosperous condition.

A good harvest is a matter of the utmost importance to this country. Besides the religious view which we wish to impress upon our readers, there is a political aspect in which the sub-

ject is to be considered. Whatever may be our political difficulties, it cannot be denied that they would be increased to a most alarming extent by the failure of the harvest. The subject was alluded to in her Majesty's speech—a grateful acknowledgment to Almighty God was rendered by the Government; and nothing could affect the interests of the country in a greater degree than a failure in the usual produce of the fruits of the earth. Of this the Radicals and the disaffected are fully aware. They would rejoice to see the country involved in distress and confusion from such a cause. Two years ago, it was said that even the seasons were in favour of Sir Robert Peel. It was considered, at that time, that a failure in the harvest would have produced such a wide-spreading feeling of discontent, as to have endangered the safety of any Administration; and there were not wanting reckless politicians, at that time, who hesitated not to express a hope that the crops might fail, in order that the Government might be embarrassed. This feeling was put forth in newspapers and in speeches. There was no attempt at concealing their secret feelings: they were openly confessed. The disaffected of all classes were influenced by the same wicked sentiments. A friend of ours heard a knot of mechanics discussing the question of the stability of the Administration, just as the harvest two years ago was closed; and their profane and anti-national remark was, speaking of Sir Robert Peel, that "*the very seasons were in his favour.*"

While, therefore, there is in the country a party holding such antichristian sentiments—while they would rejoice in any cause which might produce suffering to the country and temporary embarrassment to the Government—while they would take advantage of any circumstance to involve the nation in trouble—let us devoutly and sincerely thank God for giving us a most abundant harvest. The goodness of God has been mercifully displayed in giving us the fruits of the earth and in sending such weather as enabled the husbandman to gather them into the garner; and it behoves us, as a nation, to render our tribute of gratitude to our heavenly Father for the rich mercies of which we have been the partakers.

General Literature.

Persecutions of Popery : Historical Narratives of the most Remarkable Persecutions occasioned by the Intolerance of the Church of Rome. By FREDERIC SHOBERL. Two vols. 8vo. London : Bentley. 1844.

BEFORE the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill our apprehensions of danger in the removal of all restrictions were treated as chimerical—as grounded on the occurrences of ignorant and barbarous times—on a spirit of ferocious intolerance, created as much by national as by religious hostilities ; and we were told that in this enlightened age, and with an empire, vast, consolidated, and undisputed as was that of Great Britain, it were weak and foolish to apprehend danger from our Catholic fellow-subjects—men as well informed, subjects as loyal as ourselves, and equally with ourselves proudly disdaining all foreign interference. Besides, we were told that we knew at once the whole amount of the concessions which were required, and had, moreover, the loyal and respectable demeanour of those who asked for the concessions as an earnest of their future good conduct ; and, above all, the oaths of loyalty—not merely in a general sense, but specifically pledging them to the finality of the concessions then granted : and this, not an extorted oath, in which there might be suspicion of a degree of mental reservation, but voluntary engagements, sanctioned by their hierarchy, declaring before God that no attempts would be made or connived at by them against the established religion of these lands.

We were told that the Roman Catholics only wanted the boon that was then asked for, to become the most contented and loyal of subjects ; and that Great Britain then, united in heart and hand, from east to west, from north to south, would become a world within itself ; that such a people—too great to quarrel with others, and which it would be madness in others to provoke—would go on increasing in prosperity, and at the same time blessing mankind, and set the example which other nations would follow, in a generous rivalry of toleration and amity ; and that these halcyon days, of beating swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks, would commence from the moment of passing the Roman Catholic Relief Bill.

The present state of Ireland is the obvious, palpable, broad daylight commentary on these false and fallacious predictions—a state of things which obliges us to garrison it as if it were an enemy's territory—and where the priests, who were foremost

in swearing the people to perpetual loyalty at the former time, are now the foremost in exciting them to hatred of everything English, and to as much of sedition and open rebellion as the strength of combination among themselves, or the weakness of those who should rule them, renders at all safe or prudent. And these open and palpable signs are not those which are in our estimation the worst; for we see a spirit working in the priests, and infused by them into the people, which shows that, in lust of domination, and in rancour and intolerance, as in faith, the Papacy still remains what it was in the dark ages—that it is unchanged, unsoftened by all the boasted civilization of this enlightened age—that where there appears to be toleration, it is only infidelity—and that wheresoever there is Roman faith, it is the same intolerant Rome which we read of in history.

The animus of Ireland, under the guidance of O'Connell and the priests, has been too clearly manifested to be mistaken; every disaster likely to come upon England, whether from war, or commercial distress, or insurrection, or famine, is hailed by them as a subject of congratulation. And although some of the too open expressions of hate, and some of the direct offers of assistance by foreign forces, have been put down or waived by O'Connell, this has arisen from no good feeling, but merely from a lawyer's caution, and some little remaining fear of the Attorney-General. And it is well understood by his followers, and they are content to abide his time—the time when they may safely give vent to their feelings; in the mean time taking care to be ever “nursing their wrath to keep it warm.”

“At a time when Popery appears to be mustering all its energies for renovation of its tarnished glories and its diminished power it will scarcely be thought unseasonable to rouse the attention of the Protestant population of these realms to the means by which that Church acquired her extraordinary power—to the spirit with which she has wielded it for above a thousand years, with which she is animated to this very day, and which, unless an effectual barrier be opposed, threatens at no distant period to produce most calamitous results. Such is the object of these volumes.”—*Preface*.

“The curse of Popery rests upon unhappy Ireland, the prey of priests and political conspirators, whose seditious incitements have urged her inflammable population to the verge of rebellion. This is the real grievance under which that devoted country is suffering. Popery presses like an incubus upon it, paralyzes industry, drains its resources, depraves the national character, stifles every feeling of independence, and degrades the votaries into blind slaves of its arbitrary will.” (xv.) “Let statesmen—let legislators prate as they please of the present harmlessness of Popish principles—of the mildness of mitigated Catholic doctrines—stubborn facts give them the lie, and proclaim the unchanged

and unchangeable spirit of persecution which still rankles in the bosom of Popery." (xi.)

In contemplating Popery, the intellectual blindness and moral obtuseness which it has produced, should never be overlooked, as it is only through the obliteration of these natural attributes of man that we are able to understand, or even credit, the unnatural crimes and wholesale indiscriminate massacres which have been recorded as instances of Papal intolerance in past times. And if we see the same prostration of understanding and the same yielding of conscience still exacted from the people by the Romish clergy, we may rest assured that there will be no holding back of the hand of the people from executing any measures of intolerance, however violent, however unnatural they may appear, if they should be enjoined by a priesthood which has acquired such an ascendancy over the understandings and consciences of men. Southey seems to have been astonished at the phenomenon, while he sees it to be the only possible way of accounting for the facts; and he remarks that the priests and monks themselves must often have been utterly astonished at the success of the gross deceptions which they were continually practising on the public credulity. For

"The Church of Rome appears to have delighted in insulting, as well as in abusing, the credulity of mankind, and to have pleased itself with discovering how far it was possible to subdue and degrade the human intellect. If farther proof were needed, it would be found in the prodigious doctrine of transubstantiation. According to this, in the sacrament, when the words of consecration have been pronounced, the bread becomes that same actual body of flesh and blood in which Christ suffered upon the cross—remaining bread to the sight, touch, and taste, yet ceasing to be so; and into how many parts soever the bread may be broken, the whole entire body is contained in every part. Of all the corruptions of Christianity, there was none that the Popes so long hesitated to sanction as this. At length, at the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), it was declared by Innocent III. to be a tenet necessary to salvation. With the people, this doctrine had become popular for its very extravagance—with the clergy, because they grounded upon it their loftiest pretensions.....The priest, when he performed this stupendous function, had before his eyes, and held in his hands, the Maker of heaven and earth; and the inference which they deduced from so blasphemous an assumption was, that the clergy were not to be subject to any secular authority, seeing that they could create God, their Creator. Let it not be supposed that the statement is in the slightest degree exaggerated; it is delivered faithfully, in their own words." (p. 39).

The object of the author of this work is not so much to point
VOL. XVI.—K K

out the corruptions of the Roman Church and the superstitions it has introduced, as to record the terrible intolerance of this pseudo-Christianity, in the exterminating persecutions and wholesale massacres which it has instigated: such as whole nations, in the Albigenes and Waldenses; or from 40,000 to 100,000, as it has been variously computed, in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The author briefly traces the rise and progress of the Papal power, in the first fifty pages; and the remainder of the first volume is occupied with the persecutions of the Albigenes, the Inquisition, the Lollards, the Waldenses, and the persecutions in France, 1560-1572. The second volume treats of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the persecutions in the Cevennes, and those which have continued, as of the Salzburghers and Zillerthalers, to the present time.

And let us not too charitably or too credulously conclude that it is impossible for such scenes to be re-enacted in our own day. Ferocity is never obsolete in the natural man, and such an one, steeped in superstition, becomes twice a brute. A journal which professes to represent enlightened Romanism has written—"What a wretched mockery it is to compare the Protestantism of the miserable apostates of the Reformation to the faith of those primitive witnesses for Christ who boldly declared before Pagan tribunals that they hoped for salvation through the intercession of all the saints!" (*Dublin Review*, June, p. 317). We are of the faith of those who are thus bitterly alluded to as "miserable apostates:" and we should exceedingly shrink from the trial of being consigned over to the tender mercies of those who could thus speak of our spiritual fathers; for we are quite sure that to men of this spirit, the power only to persecute is lacking; and that to them the power only of old Rome is lacking; had they this, the fate of Huss, or of Cranmer, might be ours. It might be deemed a sacred duty of the Church to rid the world of a "*miserable apostate*."

And we think, from the whole tenor of the article to which we are alluding, that Mr. Tyler must be very much of our opinion; for it is quite evident that a stake at Smithfield would be preparing for him if such an one as Mary were now upon the throne of England. May God in his mercy avert this from us! And in the mean time let Mr. Tyler console himself, under the abuse which has been heaped upon him, by the thought, that his book must have been felt as a very heavy blow, to have drawn forth not only a long article of vituperation, but more last words in the very unusual form of an appendix of more than twenty pages. All this is mere mystification, just to throw dust in the eyes of the poor Roman Catholic dupes, and does not

touch the point in hand—does not touch the argument. We remember being present at a public discussion between Romanists and Protestants, and seeing a man enter with three prodigious folios, under the weight of which he actually staggered, and, after he had lifted them upon the table, seeing the satisfactory nod that he gave, as much as to say, “Ah ! its all over with the Protestants now”—a sentiment which seemed to be responded to in sympathetic nods by all the Romanists present. This was the first and the last public controversy at which it has been our fortune to be present ; but we were not slow in divining that these same bulky folios were not intended to be opened ; that the men who brought the books spoke for them, and it was to be presumed had read every jot and tittle, or they would never have brought them ; and if not, there were the books, and let them speak for themselves. We are quite serious in saying that the long rigmarole of names (pages 312 and 313) reminded us of this incident ; and as the books were brought in for effect, so are these “*abundant materials*.” The ponderous folios were never opened by the disputant ; the string of names in the *Review* is unaccompanied by any reference or extract ; but this is of no consequence to the self-complacent individuals and their admiring votaries.

The point undertaken to be proved was, that the worship of the *Virgin Mary*, as at present practised in the Roman Church, is an unwarrantable innovation, contrary to Scripture—contrary to the practice of the primitive Church ; and this point Mr. Tyler has proved. The reviewer knows that this point is proved—he has not the hardihood to deny that it is proved ; but he gets out of it as well as he can by the most convenient theory of *development*, and then draws off his readers to another scent, by referring to the invocation of Christ, and the doctrines of the Trinity. “We are, of course, not denying (says the reviewer) that the Catholic doctrine on the blessed *Virgin* and the saints has undergone some development since the time, *e.g.*, of the Council of Ephesus ; but this development, we will venture to say, is not by any means so material as is generally supposed.” (p. 311.) This virtually concedes the point as proved, yet does not commit the reviewer to anything definite ; for what does the development, in this instance, mean ? It means that she who was blessed *among women*, and therefore *only* a woman, became in this process of development invested with the attributes of *divinity* ; and instead of being a woman, is now regarded by Rome as on a level with God, and presented as an object of worship to all mankind. We, together with the angel Gabriel and the holy fathers of the Church, cry, “*All hail !*” to her who was so highly

favoured of the Lord; and blessed among women may she be called throughout all generations. But also, with the angel, we ascribe higher glory to the fruit of her womb; we call Him the Son of the Highest—the Son of God. We reserve for Him, and Him alone, of all the sons of men, yea, of all creatures, divine honours—worship due to God; and that because He was more than man—was God-Man—was Creator as well as creature—was God of the substance of the Father, begotten before all worlds; as well as man of the substance of His mother, born in the world.

It is mere equivocation to call the doctrine of the Trinity, or the worship of Christ, developments, in the same sense in which the worship of the Virgin Mary is called a development; and it argues either such want of precision and such confusion of thought as would incapacitate any one for discussing such subjects, or it must be set down to something worse—to mystification and a wilful attempt to deceive. For the doctrine of the Trinity, and the divinity of Christ, are found everywhere in Scripture; and these doctrines were held most surely and indisputably by the faithful from the beginning; and the development of these doctrines was no innovation whatsoever—it was only a more minute and more accurate explanation of doctrines which had always been substantially held and implicitly believed—held even by Abraham, the father of the faithful, of whom Christ testified that he rejoiced to see afar off the day of the Lord. But the worship of saints has no place, as a doctrine, in the word of God, or in the practice of the primitive Church; it came in by degrees, during corrupt times, and as a novelty; and in order to render it tolerable, the Roman clergy were tempted to commit the further crime of mutilating the word of God—as in striking out the second commandment, which forbids such idolatry; and then, infatuated in folly, and grown wanton in their sensuality, they proceeded to the extremity of striking out the name of Jehovah from the divinely-inspired Psalms, and of substituting the name of Mary for Jehovah. Is this development? When the doctrines of the Trinity were brought out more clearly, and when Christ was most directly and intelligently worshipped, David, had he been then on earth, would have rejoiced, would have joined with all the faithful in their worship, and acknowledged that it was the development of *the same truth* which he had held in germ and embryo—that the being of the same Jehovah was developed in the Trinity and worshipped in Christ Jesus. But would the holy Psalmist—would the man after God's heart, have consented to substitute the name of Mary for that of Jehovah, in hymns dictated by the

Holy Ghost, composed in honour of God and of Christ? Would he have acknowledged that such a substitution was a development of the truth which was in his mind, when rapt into the prophetic utterance of these sacred lyrics? Are we not sure that he would repudiate the association, as much as he would resent the profanation and blasphemy?

Low indeed must the reverence of the word of God have become among a people who could perpetrate, and tolerate, and justify such things as these, and call them developments of truth. And we can only account for such infatuation on the supposition that God, as in the case of the Jews, does abandon those who first abandon him. And for such men to call the Reformers "miserable apostates" is of little moment when we remember who are the accusers, and what the Reformers had forsaken. To forsake a corrupt communion, which had in itself all the marks of apostasy, in mutilating and changing the word of God, and setting up practices which are expressly forbidden therein, is not a crime, but a duty and a virtue. Until things change their character, and words change their meaning, such false charges will recoil upon the head of the accuser. And it is they who *turn aside* from God, not they who *cleave* to him—it is they who worship *miserable mortals* like themselves, in place of JEHOVAH—it is the idolators of Rome who will be regarded, by men of truth, as the "*miserable apostates*."

The Parent's High Commission. London: Hatchard and Son. THE object of this excellent little book is to impress upon parents their responsibility—to remind them that Church and State alike look to the guardians of the fire-side circle. Without the training at the mother's knee, the efforts of the school-master are too frequently abortive, and the interference of the magistrate rendered necessary. But this simple, and scriptural, and incontrovertible fact is too much overlooked in the present day.

"In this day of high intellectual culture, of refined taste, and of shining accomplishment (asks the author before us), is the heart schooled? We make the scholar, but do we train the man?—we adorn the sylph, but do we form the woman?"

We fear these questions must, by a majority of parents, be answered in the negative; and yet it is to the quiet silent work of home that nations have to look for the future character of their clergy, their legislators, their magistrates, their merchants. Private virtue must precede public virtue. Good institutions originate with good men; and these must have been reared by parental care in private before they can act in public.

Illustrations of the Tragedies of Sophocles, from the Greek, Latin, and English Poets; with an Introductory Essay. By J. F. BOYES, M.A., St. John's College, Oxford. Oxford. 1844.

WE have some difficulty in expressing our opinion of this work; it is, we believe, the second part of a series, of which *Æschylus* was the first. As we have not the first part at hand, and do not find any introductory essay attached to the second part, it is not easy to ascertain the exact intention of the undertaking. We are inclined to say, upon opening the volume, "*Cui bono?*"—whom will it profit? Is it intended for bearded men, or beardless boys? Is it to give increased facility of rendering English verse into the metres of Greek tragedy, or to give greater spirit to translations from the original? These queries may be satisfactorily answered in the essay, so we forbear from speaking very definitely. Thus much, however, we may say, that we think the work would have been much more useful in the exhibition of parallel phraseology, if, first, *Sophocles* had only been illustrated by English; secondly, if that English had been confined to *Shakspeare*, *Ben Jonson*, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, *Massinger*, *Ford*, and perhaps one or two other dramatists; and, thirdly, if the illustration was forcible, and served to exhibit the idioms of the two languages. If these conditions fail, we think a book of illustrations must degenerate into a mere curious commonplace book. For instance, *King Lear* says—

"I am a man
More sinned against than sinning."

We are glad to know the corresponding idea in Greek, and, accordingly, we thank Mr. Boyes for supplying it, although we believe *Elmsley* had done it before, and we also remember seeing the same lines used in an exercise that obtained the Porson prize at Cambridge some few years since. At any rate, from whatever source obtained, such illustrations are useful: they are hints how to exactly express English thoughts in a Greek dress, and cannot fail to direct the mind to a comparison of phraseology. Looking at Mr. Boyes's work with this feeling, we cannot fail to notice a vast breadth of reading, both in English Latin, and Greek; but we recognize very few such illustrations as the one above: many are really no illustrations at all, as the corresponding English and Greek passages have only a word or two in common. Thus, in the *Ajax*, the illustrations with the annexed figures, 169, 264, 286, 418, 513, 622, 747, 832, with several others, do not at all come up to our idea of illustrations. Those marked 636, 660, 795, 843, 1,196, are very different, and might be made practically useful. It is not, however, fair

to speak very definitely without knowing the exact intention of the author; so, in conclusion, we only say, what we can fairly say, that in the volume many illustrations are very happy, many entirely the contrary, and that a vast body of reading is displayed, especially in the older English authors.

The Historian's Common-place Book and Companion; consisting of a Key, and Tabular Arrangements. By the Writer of "Lessons in Ancient History." London: Hatchard; Varty; and Nisbet.

HISTORY rises to the highest degree of importance, and attains its highest dignity of character, when it becomes subservient to religion—strengthening faith by pointing to fulfilled prophecy; consoling affliction by tracing the ways of Providence. The whole arrangement, of the help before us, is novel, and presents much to recommend itself; the tabular part is quite original, and will be found convenient and profitable to students. In the classes of our national schools it might be adopted with advantage; large slates could be introduced on which permanent lines should be drawn, when the pupils might alternately analyze a century, tracing the heads and figures, in chalk, agreeably to the tabular lithograph. Of course young persons should be gradually prepared for this exercise; and, habitually pursued, it must of necessity tend to energize and invigorate the mental faculties. Plato accustomed his followers to the process of analysis; and Abercrombie advocates the use of association to strengthen the memory: in what is here offered, both these principles are involved. Again, the tabular arrangement may be used in history as blank maps are applied in geography; the lines answering to those of latitude and longitude, showing at a glance the precise and relative bearings of all that can form the subject of a date. Its design is to make of history what it ought to be—a school for virtue and wisdom: its tendency is to ameliorate the heart, enrich the mind, and regulate its stores; not to cultivate one faculty at the expense of another, but by the salutary exercise of each, to give tone to the intellect generally.

A Letter upon the Subject of Confirmation, addressed to the Little ones of his Flock. By an ENGLISH PRIEST. Newbury. 1844.

WE cannot agree with the author, that "there is but little danger of open infidelity in these days." We believe that there is great danger; and we feel sure, that if our author resided in this metropolis, he would entertain the same opinion. But this is a matter of little importance. The tract itself is likely to be useful.

The Religion of Ancient Britain ; or, a Succinct Account of the several Religious Systems which have obtained in this Island from the Earliest Times to the Norman Conquest. Including an Investigation into the Early Progress of Error in the Christian Church, the Introduction of the Gospel into Britain, and the State of Religion in England till Popery had the ascendancy. By G. SMITH, F.A.S. London: Longmans.

THIS work supplies a desideratum in British Ecclesiastical History. Although many particulars are incidentally found in the various writers who have explored the ancient history of Britain, yet a work was wanting which should bring together a condensed view of the whole subject. That work Mr. Smith has now furnished: his volume, in fact, may be regarded as a supplement to every existing history of England and Wales. The following are the important topics which he has discussed, viz.:—The ancient Britons, their religion, and subjection to the Romans; the religion introduced into Britain by the Romans; the introduction of Christianity; the arrival and ascendancy of the Saxons; the religion of the Saxons; the progress of Christianity from the departure of the Romans to the mission of Augustine; the progress of error in the Church of Rome prior to the mission of Augustine; the mission of Augustine, and the spread of Christianity among the Anglo-Saxons; the religion of the Saxon and British Churches under the establishment of Romish uniformity; the learning, doctrines, and piety of the Anglo-Saxon Church; the priesthood, corruption, and decline of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Mr. Smith has carefully weighed the conflicting statements of historians on some points of early British history, and has (withal) happily succeeded in eliciting the truth. Where he has met with important facts well narrated, he has *honestly* quoted the very words of his authorities; and has so happily interwoven them, as to produce a readable and instructive volume. We have been much gratified with the candid and Christian spirit which pervades the whole work. In the event of a second edition, we would recommend him to reconsider and correct the erroneous views, which he has derived from Lord King and Mosheim, on the subject of primitive bishops. Lord King's assertions were examined in detail, and refuted, by a contemporary writer, Mr. Solater, in "An Original Draught of the Primitive Church"—a work so powerful and convincing as ultimately to bring over Lord King to his opinion. An abridgment of Solater's "Original Draught" was annexed, in the form of very copious notes, to a reprint of the *first* part of Lord King's "Inquiry into the Constitution, &c., of the Primitive Church," published in 1843, by Seeleys and Burnside.

Authenticated Report of the Discussion which took place between the Rev. John Venn and the Rev. James Waterworth, in St. Peter's School-room, Hereford, on the 12th, 13th, 14th, and 15th of February, 1844. Hereford, printed. London : Seeley and Burnside; and Dolman. 8vo. 1844.

MR. VENN has long been known as a devoted parochial clergyman at Hereford. Having ascertained that two of his parishioners were in danger of being perverted to Popery, he exerted himself to prevent them from being led away into error, but in vain. He then invited, perhaps we should say, challenged the Romish priest resident at Hereford, Mr. Waterworth, to a public discussion. Mr. Waterworth, shrinking from the contest, proposed his brother, a Romish priest resident at Newark, as his substitute. Mr. Venn agreed to meet the veteran polemic of Newark, strong in the panoply of truth. The discussion accordingly took place, February 12th, and three following days : and we should not do justice to Mr. Venn if we did not notice the modest and Christian tone with which he conducted his arguments, and which presents a most striking contrast to the insolent behaviour of Mr. Waterworth, which at length provoked the indignation of the audience ! In two or three minor points, indeed, Mr. Waterworth had the advantage : but the victory, upon the whole, is most decidedly with Mr. Venn. In conducting his portion of the discussion, he carefully cited the accredited decrees, Breviaries, and other authentic books and documents of the Romish Church : which (however Mr. Waterworth might find it convenient to declare that he "rupudiated" them) yet subsist indelible memorials of the antisciptural and unscriptural tenets and practices of the Romish Church. We have been particularly gratified with Mr. Venn's proofs of the Mariolatry of Rome, derived from the famous "Psalter" of Bonaventure, a canonized saint of the Romish Church. We commend the Hereford discussion to the attentive perusal of our readers ; who, we are assured, will rejoice to learn that the Protestant cause—the cause of truth and of pure and undefiled religion—was not only well sustained by Mr. Venn, but has also gained by it. The volume is very neatly finished, and contains a great amount of most important information at a very small price.

Rhymes for a Royal Nursery. London : Painter. 1844.

A MOST acceptable present for children—well printed, nicely bound ; and the rhymes, though simple, are not silly, as nursery ditties mostly are.

The Lyra Ecclesiastica ; consisting of Voluntaries, Introits, Chants, Services, Anthems, Sanctuses, &c., by eminent living Composers. By the Rev. JOSHUA FAWCETT, M.A., Incumbent of Wibsey, Bradford, Yorkshire, and Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Lord Dunsany. London: Rivingtons.

It affords us considerable pleasure to have to notice this unique volume. A work which would embody and set before us the genius of our living composers could scarcely fail to be interesting; whilst the scrutiny of so competent a critic as the Rev. W. H. Havergal, M.A., to whom the editor submitted every contribution, led us to expect, at all events, a classical selection. Yet we were by no means prepared to meet with a work like the one before us, which, in appearance as well as in intrinsic excellence, is really a delightful volume; and which, whilst it does not exhibit the characteristics of the prevailing Church music of the day, is calculated to effect a higher object—to impart a character *to it*, or rather to recall us to the good old yet immortal style of Tarrant, Gibbons, and Boyce, in the spirit of whom almost every composition introduced seems to have been written. This work is one which reminds us of the almost forgotten fact, that the Church has a musical phraseology of her own—simple, yet sublime; massive, yet not gloomy; fervid, yet not frivolous; and it augurs well for ecclesiastical composition that so many different composers, comprising almost all living ones of any note, have manifested a just appreciation of that beauty in music which is, when

“Unadorned, adorned the most,”

by furnishing contributions so classical, chaste, and elegantly simple, as are to be met with in the volume now before us. The Preface contains a well, written, though concise history of Church music, tracing its origin, progress, and decay, and will amply repay perusal.

The following remarks are as just as they are severe:—

“With few exceptions, our parochial churches are conversant with a style of psalm and hymn tune which would have shocked our pious forefathers. Instead of the severe but masculine melody of their day, with a syllabic utterance and a fine rich harmony, all moving in stately, yet easy and *un-drawing* precision, our Church population are habituated to either a dronish, whining, or effeminate class of tunes, in which noise is mistaken for harmony, and secularity for devotion. In fact, most of the tunes are made up of snatches from songs, glees, ballads, marches, and even more indecorous productions, and are as incapable of good harmonization, as they are of inspiring either warm or elevated feelings.” (Preface, p. 15).

We have not space to particularize individual compositions—

we may, however, just mention a "Te Deum" by Couchman—a name which deserves to be better known; "Nunc Dimitatis," by the Rev. G. S. Faber, B.D., Prebendary of Salisbury; and an elaborate anthem from the "Te Deum," with the "Trisagion," by the same, in which the editor has discovered an intricacy of construction unperceived by the composer; also a sweet anthem from one of the collects, by Elvey; several excellent anthems by the editor, and one by Kelloroe Pye. The sanctuses and responses are, we think, particularly beautiful; and the chants and psalm tunes are all in a good ecclesiastical style.

The book is beautifully got up (in colours and gold), and is dedicated to her Majesty Queen Adelaide, and can boast of a highly influential list of patrons and subscribers; the proceeds are to be applied to ecclesiastical purposes. We beg to congratulate the editor on having brought his labours to so successful an issue, in thus producing a work which, we think, does honour to the age in which it is published. We are glad to learn that it is already out of print, and that a *second edition* is called for. Altogether, the "Lyra Ecclesiastica" is a work which we cordially recommend to all who wish to study Church music, as it has been, ought to be, and, we hope we may add, soon again will be.

Cambridge Prize Essays. The Christian System Vindicated against the more Popular Forms of Modern Infidelity. By the Rev. DANIEL MOORE, M.A., Minister of Christ Chapel, St. John's Wood. Second Edition, with Additions. London: Bohn. 1844.

THE volume before us is divided into three parts, presenting a connected refutation of the principal objections advanced by modern infidelity against Christianity. These three parts originally were three essays, which obtained the Norrisian and Hulsean prizes, at Cambridge, in the years 1837, 1838, and 1839, and which the learned and reverend author has been induced to publish in this connected form. The difference between the essays in their present shape, and when they obtained academic rewards, does not affect the substantial identity of the compositions. A good deal of historical matter is interwoven with the first essay, which originally appeared in the form of an appendix; and in the second and third, many marginal quotations from the Greek and Latin fathers, as well as from classical authors, are omitted, properly enough we think, from a work designed for popular circulation. Mr. Moore has performed an acceptable service to the cause of Christian truth in the publication of his prize essays in their present cheap, concise, and intelligible form.

The Jasper Clouded and the Rainbow round the Throne. A Farewell Sermon. By the Rev. R. A. WILLMOTT. Preached on Trinity Sunday, June 2, 1844. London : Nickisson.

THERE is a fanciful and poetic handling of this subject which is not so much to our taste as a dryer and deeper tone would be ; we rather expected, in such a subject and on such a day, more of theology and less of its practical application. But Mr. Willmott, doubtless, knew his audience, and seems to think that even this discourse may be too elaborate, and half apologizes for it by referring to the effect which a cathedral service has upon those who may not enter into the meaning of all its services, or of its architecture and decorations ; in the fretted roof, the illuminated windows, the dim religious light, they recognize the spell of a mysterious influence—

“ It is exactly so with that structure of spiritual skill entitled a sermon. It may seem to be above the capacities of many who listen to it.....an impression may, nevertheless, be produced upon their minds, of which the solemnizing grandeur of the cathedral is a lively illustration.” (p. 30).

And it is pleasing to gather, from the manner in which all the different classes of his hearers are addressed, that Mr. Willmott's labours of love have been appreciated by old and young, by high and low. We were particularly gratified in reading his address to the latter class—

“ Sweet is the thought to me, now gazing for the last time upon that central aisle, to recognize the familiar faces of those who, having seen the salvation of their Lord, may hope, through his grace, to depart in peace.....With what sentiments of thankfulness I have looked down, Sabbath after Sabbath, upon those seats of my humbler friends, once so deserted, now so crowded, is known only to Him who, having called me, as I trust, to this office and ministry, has poured into my heart a desire to set forth his glory, and to set forward the salvation of his people.” (p. 32). —

Protestant Missions in Bengal. By J. J. Weitbrecht, Church Missionary. London : Shaw. 1844.

THIS volume contains the substance of a course of lectures on Indian Missions, delivered by the author in different parts of Germany and Switzerland, and afterwards translated by him, and delivered in London. It is the work of an apparently sincere and zealous man, but offers nothing beyond commonplace views of Indian superstitions and missionary labours, and savours somewhat too much of the platform for a Churchman's taste. It may, however, be usefully presented to readers who have not any information upon Hindoo mythology and manners, and the efforts which are making to overthrow a belief in the former, and to correct and purify the latter.

The Duties of the Christian Ministry ; with a View of the Primitive and Apostolical Church, and the Danger of Departing from its Doctrine and Discipline. By the Rev. B. BAILEY, M.A., Senior Colonial Chaplain of the Island of Ceylon. London: Painter. 1844.

THE basis of this volume is a sermon preached at Colombo, at an ordination held by the Lord Bishop of Madras ; but the greater part of it consists of notes and appendix, containing very copious extracts, in support of the assertions made and principles maintained in the sermon. These refer to apostolical succession ; the principles of the Church of England ; the word "priest" ; the foreign Episcopal Churches ; the state of religion in Germany and Prussia ; calvinism ; personal religion ; conduct towards native ministers and inhabitants of Ceylon ; theological studies ; ancient literature in Iceland and the north of Europe, &c.

It hence appears that the chaplains in our distant colonies are not always unprovided with books, and that they often take a very wide range in their enquiries ; for the extracts on all the above-named subjects are from the best writers, and to the point. And, moreover, the principles they are meant to inculcate are sound, and the spirit in which they are brought forward is charitable, which, in those whose lot is cast in these distant colonies, are qualities of the greatest importance ; since the principles and the spirit must be formed and regulated before they leave home, for no great acquisition, and no wholesome corrective or check, can be reasonably looked for in those outlying posts—those comparative wildernesses and solitudes—where enlightened intercourse must be, like angels visits, few and far between.

"Consistent Churchmen (says Mr. Bailey) are charged with bigotry, intolerance, and a host of secular and unworthy passions and feelings. Be it so. Conscious rectitude of purpose can bear much more. We have counted the cost—we have searched our hearts. With the blessing of the grace of God, we will not abandon our post.....But let us humbly examine our own hearts, whether these things be so ; and let us guard against the intrusion of such unhallowed feelings within the sanctuary. *Humile Sapiamus.*"

Life in Athens, in the Time of Pericles ; illustrative of Ancient and Modern Democracy. From the German of Von Wessenberg. London: Painter. 1844.

A LIVELY and seasonable publication, tending to allay the fever of democracy, and keep the parties opposed in good humour with each other, instead of exasperating them needlessly.

The First Voyage of Rodolph the Voyager. By "G. D. L." London: Burns. 1844.

There is much that is beautiful, and much that is excellent, in this little work, which is of the allegorical class; but it is not equal to many works of the same kind published by Mr. Burns: we would especially indicate the admirable allegories of Arch-deacon Wilberforce. As "*Rodolph's Voyages*" are to be continued, we would suggest that the real and the figurative should be kept more distinct. The part before us would produce confusion and bewilderment in a young mind, amidst which the efficacy of the valuable lesson inculcated would certainly be lessened, and probably be lost. But the lesson is so good, that we wish, in the succeeding part, it may be more clearly unfolded.

Fifty Pictorial Illustrations of the Life of our Lord. From the Old Masters, as Pictures defining Lessons for Classes; accompanied by a General Outline of the Gospel History. By R. MIMPRISS. London: Varty. 1844.

This is a very superior work, for the purpose of imparting and impressing the Gospel history on the minds of the young. The "General Outline" may be profitably perused by many an adult; for it brings the holy life of our Lord before the eye of a reader in so compact a form, that the harmony of the Gospels is perceptible by those who may not be able to carry in their memory points of correspondence scattered over a wide surface.

-
1. *Six Thousand Years Ago; or, the Works of Creation.* Illustrated by Mrs. BEST. Bath: Binns and Goodwin. 1844.
 2. *Naboth the Jezreelite, and other Poems.* By ANNE FLINDERS. Bath: Binns and Goodwin. 1844.

THESE productions, from the pens of two ladies, are exceedingly well worthy of patronage. The elegant volume for which we are indebted to Mrs. Best tells usefully and eloquently of the divine work of the six days, its purpose and its consequences. The authoress has accomplished her task with great ability, and has produced a book eminently adapted to the young. We may add, that the illustrations are in very good taste.

Miss Flinders' smaller work displays considerable feeling, and a creditable capacity for writing in measured lines. Indeed, the true inspiration of song is not unfrequently caught; and some of the minor poems show this in an unusual degree.

London: W. E. Painter, Church and State Gazette Office, 342, Strand.



